THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE IN COLONIAL CANTERBURY;

A STUDY OF THE

CANTERBURY WORKING MAN'S POLITICAL PROTECTION AND MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION (1865-66),

AND THE

CANTERBURY FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY (1866-70)

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in History

in the

University of Canterbury

by

G. R. Wright

University of Canterbury

1998

CONTENTS

Abbreviations.....1

Abstract.....2

Preface.....3

1. The Petty Bourgeoisie.....7

2. Occupations.....35

3. Politics.....71

4. Land.....108

5. Voluntary Participation.....137

Conclusions.....161

Appendices.....163

References.....191

ABBREVIATIONS

AJHR	*Appendix to the Journal of the House of Representatives*
DNZB	*Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*
CPER	*Electoral Roll of the Province of Canterbury*
FLS	Canterbury Freehold Land Society
NZJH	*New Zealand Journal of History*
NZPD	*New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*
WMA	Canterbury Working Man's Political Protection and Mutual Improvement Association

ABSTRACT

This thesis argues for the existence of a distinct petty bourgeois socio-economic class, with particular liberal values, in colonial Christchurch. It approaches this through an examination of two related mid-Victorian Christchurch institutions, the Canterbury Working Man's Association and the Canterbury Freehold Land Society, and of the wider activities of their members. The first chapter looks at the issue of class definition and identity, and perceptions of the social topography of the mid-Victorian period. The four chapters that follow relate the characteristics of the British petty bourgeoisie to the colonial environment, and in so doing, distinguish a colonial petty bourgeoisie that is broadly similar, but with some significant variation. These differences centre on the ideology of liberalism, and its idealistic precept, 'independence'. The independence oriented colonial environment produced a petty bourgeois who were assertively liberal. This shows in a heightened expectation of government intervention in employment and land distribution, and serves to highlight differences between the political liberalism of the petty bourgeois and that of the governing bourgeois. The individualistic and idealistic notion of a colonial independence also meant that the petty bourgeoisie pursued a different course of self-improvement than did their British counterparts. Some self-help institutions important in Britain were insignificant in colonial Christchurch. The acquisition of land became particularly pivotal, though a disjunction between rhetoric and practice shows that this may have had a different meaning for the petty bourgeois than it did for other classes of colonist.

PREFACE

When I began my thesis, I had intended to broadly examine nineteenth-century immigration to Canterbury. Quickly this was refined to an examination of contemporary attitudes to immigration in the 1860s. Whilst reading the *Lyttelton Times* in order to recover these attitudes, I found the names of certain individuals recurring time and again, not only in discussion of immigration, but also in other leading debates on subjects such as access to land and political representation. These men were literate, politically aware, socially active, and concerned to further their interests, but they were evidently not middle class in a subjective sense. Part of the question of the identity of the group was answered when I discovered many of these men united in an organisation called the Canterbury Working Man's Association (WMA), and an offshoot, the Canterbury Freehold Land Society (FLS). The thesis subsequently evolved into an examination of the significance of these Christchurch organisations and of their membership - who they were; what their class identity was; where they fitted socially, politically and economically; what their values and objectives were; and the impact (if any) that the organizations had on the lives of members. It posits that the membership were representative of a large and distinctive social class in colonial Christchurch - the petty bourgeoisie, and articulated vital parts of the identity of this class in their opinions and actions.

The first, historiographical, chapter distinguishes the intellectual, social, and economic complexion of the mid-Victorian British petty bourgeoisie. It examines the place and type of class identity in the mid-Victorian period; and outlines leading debates concerning the evolution of its petty bourgeoisie and their liberal value system. The second chapter examines the occupational character of the British petty bourgeoisie and the values associated with it, and then compares this with the members of the WMA and the FLS. It speculates on the relation between colonial petty bourgeois values and the development of trade unions, and then relates occupational character and values to the participation of members of the two organizations in the unemployment agitations in 1864, 1867, 1868, and 1870. Chapter three

looks at the liberal political ideology of the petty bourgeoisie, its colonial permutations, and the manner in which the WMA expressed these ideas during the 1866 provincial election. The fourth chapter looks at the significance of land in liberal ideology - particularly its equation with independence - through the medium of the WMA, which supported access to land, and the FLS, which worked for land acquisition. It concludes that independence through land may have had a distinct petty bourgeois meaning. Finally, the fifth chapter canvasses the wider social links of members, and the extent to which these fit the profile and values of petty bourgeois liberalism. Nonconformity, temperance, and self-help organizations are among those factors considered.

There are certain provisos to be made when drawing conclusions from the available evidence. The first problem is one of sources. Many sources are selective in the detail they record, and rounded pictures emerge of only a few individuals. Newspapers such as the *Lyttelton Times* were unashamedly partisan and elitist, and may well have excised more extreme expressions of petty bourgeois consciousness. A lack of detail about many individuals may also, however, be an indicator of a low public profile. Secondly, the identification of the individual members of these two organizations has been rendered difficult by the contemporary journalistic practice of normally using surnames only. Thus in the case of common surnames, assumptions have to be made on the basis of available biographical detail as to the likely identity of the individual. For example, the treasurer of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society was a Mr Wilson. There are two possible candidates, both with the Christian name William. One was a Kaiapoi accountant, and the other a Christchurch nurseryman and businessman. I selected the latter rather than the former because he was particularly prominent in the public arena in Christchurch at this time. Consequently my interpretation of the identity of the sample may to a degree be perceived to be predetermined by my thesis. However to mitigate this, I have indicated where I believe an uncertainty of identity exists.

The second problem is one of interpretation of evidence. Christchurch during the 1860s was a small town with a limited pool of those able and willing to participate in forms of association. The membership of organizations such as the Canterbury Working Man's Association was therefore small. This means that the drawing of conclusions can in some cases be tentative only. The smallness of the sample may also mean that the class profile of particular types of association was less pronounced, and involvement in a broad range of interests more likely.

One great question can be seen, thus, to loom over the strength of the argument constructed in this thesis. This is the issue of typicality. Just how representative of their social class were the men sampled? I argue that evidence suggests these individuals were objectively petty bourgeois in class complexion, the class in which the ideology of liberalism reached its most powerful expression. The membership of both organizations is sufficiently occupationally diverse that their statements may be perceived as articulating a petty bourgeois position. Naturally many individuals featured in the *Lyttelton Times* because they were particularly outspoken, passionate, or downright irascible. The exaggerated character of some of their rhetoric does not mean, however, that they were any less representative.

It must also be recognized, however, that as much as they identified with their fellow members, many members also felt themselves, subjectively, to be part of a greater class of 'working men'. This class, as conceived by contemporaries, probably encompassed a wider range of occupations and economic status. The degree of conviction with which those of the sample sought to speak as, and for 'workmen', shows that they believed were articulating a liberal ethos that had infused this greater class to some degree at all levels. For wage-earning constituents, however, the ideology of liberalism in its more advanced form would not necessarily have been so self-evidently relevant or compelling, and probably took different and less dogmatic forms.

Note: In this thesis, a distinction is drawn between liberalism (with a lower case 'L') and Liberalism (with a capital 'L'). The first of these terms was the predominant socio-

economic and political credo of Britain and her colonies in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and the second the formal political expression of liberalism. The general tenets of liberalism discussed will be of the first type unless otherwise distinguished.

CHAPTER 1: THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE IN CONTEXT

The contention of this thesis is that the Canterbury Freehold Land Society and the Canterbury Working Man's Association were primarily petty bourgeois organizations, and that the membership therefore reflected the economic, political, and social characteristics of this class.[1] This chapter looks at historical and contemporary efforts to delineate this class and its place in mid-Victorian society, and why the term 'petty bourgeoisie' is an appropriate label. It considers the character and values of the class, and also attempts to trace some of the various schemes advanced to explain the social evolution of the mid-Victorian British petty bourgeoisie - particularly as this relates to an apparent transition from a radical ideology to a liberal ideology. Understanding the petty bourgeoisie as a class contributes to an understanding of their part in Canterbury society in the 1860s.

Definition

The central problem in discussing the values and ideology of Victorian (and particularly mid-Victorian) class is one of definition, as both historical and contemporary attempts at class identification have lacked uniformity. The multiplicity of contemporary definition is partly the product of the recognition of the subjective sectionalism of historical Victorian class definition. Biagini, for example, suggests the phrase 'working classes' as more appropriate than the singular.[2] In a similar vein, Parry insists that no 'working class' spokesman can be considered representative of the masses because of the diversity of the experience of industrialization between different trades.[3] This contemporary diversity is also a function of the (sometimes inappropriate) application of definitions that have originated in a different period of social, political and economic activity

---

[1] At an initial meeting the organization was declared to be the Canterbury Working Man's Political Protection and Mutual Improvement Association. *Lyttelton Times* 23 December, 1865. In references thereafter, it was abbreviated to 'Working Man's Association'. The *DNZB* entry for John St Quentin calls it the Canterbury Workingmen's Association. *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* vol I (W. Oliver ed.) Wellington: Bridget Williams Books/Department of Internal Affairs, 1990. p 382-3.

[2] E. Biagini and A. Reid (ed) *Currents of Radicalism: Popular Radicalism, Organized Labour, and Party Politics in Britain, 1850- 1914* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. p 14

[3] J. Parry *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party 1867-75* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. p 232.

This diversity of social and economic experience is reflected in an heterogeneous historical language of mid-Victorian class. This heterogeneity was a function of the co-existence of a number of world views. In 1974, Briggs identified three concurrent languages in the mid-nineteenth century. The oldest of the three was the pre-industrial division of ranks, orders, and degrees. Although anachronistic, this language of 'interests' was, says Briggs, still employed by social conservatives - and indeed undergoing something of a new vogue in the 1850s and 1860s. The youngest language was the tripartite one of social 'class'. This had been a product of the large scale changes of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, and was utilized particularly by social critics. 'Class' was widely perceived in the mid-Victorian period as having unpleasant associations, its innate egoism seen as pushing it into attempting to gain an undue share of the proceeds of social production. The third language Briggs called a social cross-current, drawing from both 'interest' and 'class' to separate the 'industrious classes' from the 'rest'. In the mid-Victorian era, the duality served particularly to draw a distinction between the articulate 'labour interest' and the residual masses. Briggs considers this language something of a positivistic counterpoint to the language of social class, being utilized by those 'who were more impressed by the productive possibilities of large scale industry than afraid of social disintegration'. This seems to imply a provenance in the same period as the language of class, and a certain industrial economic context; both of which are questionable. Rather, however, this dualistic language stemmed from the old 'radical' social typology of the eighteenth century that existed in conjunction with the language of 'interests', and predated that of 'class'. The outcome of this complex typology of mid-Victorian social class was an endless series of social gradations. Consequently the dividing line between classes was difficult to draw, the divisions within prescriptive classes being sometimes greater than those between.[4]

The members of the FLS and the WMA that constitute the colonial sample group clearly exhibit this catholic, class descriptive character. They referred to themselves, and

[4] A. Briggs 'The Language of Class in Early Nineteenth Century England' M. Flinn and T. Smout, (ed.)*Essays in Social History* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974. pp 154-171

were referred to by observers in a variety of terms drawn from different typologies of social class. These terms and typologies themselves prove somewhat elastic, and exact meaning could depend very much on circumstance and the particular effect sought by the user. The terms could, for example, serve variously to unite, or to divide the retail and manufacturing components of the group.

The diversity of contemporary terminology employed to describe the members of the sample included 'operatives',[5] 'industrial class',[6] 'labouring class',[7] 'mechanics', 'artizans' (sic),. and 'workmen' (or 'workingmen') - of which the latter three appear most often. 'Workman' appears to be a broad overarching category, referring to those who worked with their hands, independent of their employment status or skill. It could therefore ideally be applied collectively to labourers, tradesmen, and retailers. With the addition of the epithet 'skilled', however, it frequently refers only to the latter of the two 'classes'. 'Artisan' appears to be a subset of 'skilled workman', effectively interchangeable with the term mechanic or tradesman, and implying qualification, and in this context probably self employment. It may also, however, be seen to be a cultural identification related to skill, but wholly independent of an individual's relation to the means of production. Indeed it is arguable that the cultural characteristics to which the epithet was tagged were more significant to users than as an objective definition. Under the first meaning, McAloon is painting with too broad a brush when he uses 'artisan' as a blanket term, to accommodate all the manual workers of mid-Victorian Nelson society who were not farmers.[8] If employing the second meaning, however, McAloon may be justified in his generality. Evidence suggests that even if this latter meaning was not widely understood in New Zealand in the 1860s, it had become so by the 1880s when the skilled proletariat in the large scale enterprizes of South Dunedin identified as artisans.[9]

---

[5] *Lyttelton Times* 23 April 1868
[6] ibid, 17 July 1868 (J. St Quentin)
[7] ibid, 11 May 1868 (J. Elliott)
[8] J. McAloon, "Artisan Democracy in New Zealand: Nelson in the 1850s" *History Now* vol. 3 no. 2, 1997. pp 16-21.
[9] E. Olssen, *Building the New World: Work, Politics, and Society in Caversham 1880's-1920's* Auckland:

Both 'workman' and 'artizan' fit within the context of the mid-Victorian interpretation of the social typology that sets the 'productive' against the 'unproductive'. They may also be seen, however, to fit within the broadly economic and vaguely hierarchical contemporary social typology entitled 'interests'. The socio-economic 'interests' of Canterbury were somewhat nebulous, but were probably rendered in categories like 'commercial', 'professional', 'farming', 'pastoral' and 'working'.[10] All 'workingmen' were bundled indiscriminately into the last category, but the internal divisions of this interest, and particularly the uncertain status of the retailer may have blurred the divide with the 'commercial'. Co-existing with the typologies of 'interests' and of 'productivity' in mid-Victorian Canterbury was a dualistic capital and labour divide. This was not, however, in wide-spread use; and in a seminal form nor was it an absolute division around ones relation to the means of production. Rather, it was a more subjective, permissive formulation where the 'capitalist' was one who employed a significant amount of capital (as either a pastoralist or businessman), and the 'labourer' was comprised of both the small self-employed capitalist and the proletarian. Thus, there were at least three social typologies being used more or less interchangeably in Christchurch in the 1860s. The amorphous nature of class definition meant that men who were ostensibly members of the petty bourgeoisie could, with equal validity, identify themselves as working-class or middle-class.

This makes the differentiation of the petty bourgeoisie from the bourgeois in colonial Christchurch problematic. Just as personal identification as part of the group of 'working men' (of which the petty bourgeoisie were a part) was as important as any objective criteria, so it was with the middle-class. Consequently, there was little, if anything, to differentiate the elite of the former from parts of the latter. This said, there appears to have been a middle-class core of merchants and professionals, separated by life-style and education from the 'working man'.

Auckland University Press, 1995.

[10] When John St Quentin nominated Samuel Andrews for the Christchurch seat of the provincial council, he proclaimed 'The commercial, professional, and pastoral interests appeared hitherto to have been well represented, but not so those of the working classes'. *Lyttelton Times* 14 June 1866.

The question arises as to why the pre-industrial (or proto-industrial) formulations of class had such currency in mid-Victorian Christchurch. There are at least two facets to the answer. The most obvious of these is that enterprize was small scale and personal, and to identify it by traditional terminology was therefore logical. Secondly (as will be demonstrated), the social ideology that held the greatest currency at this time idealized the pre-industrial past, and as Briggs points out, was antithetical to ideas of 'class'.

There seems a general historical consensus that a newly politicised group was emerging in British society in the first half of the nineteenth century. This is where the consensus ends, however, for there is considerable confusion over the identity of this historical group. This is at least partly the result of the complexity of Victorian class definition. A diverse range of contemporary terminology has therefore been employed in an attempt to describe the phenomena. Some historians write broadly of the rise of a 'working class' or 'popular' milieu at this time. Others who paint with a finer brush distinguish the ascendancy of a lower middle class[11], a 'middling' class[12], a petty bourgeoisie, artisans, or a labour aristocracy - all of which exclude the labourer. However, these labels are not necessarily predicated on precisely the same theoretical assumptions, the same time scale, or even the same socio-economic group, and are often employed in very different historical interpretations of mid-Victorian society. The problem is not helped by the failure of the Victorians to recognize a separate identity for this group.

One of the more successful interpretations of mid Victorian social class is that of Crossick and Haupt.[13] This is at least partly because it attempts to objectively address the issue of class composition.[14] Crossick and Haupt discern the emerging group to have been

---

[11] G. Best, *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851-75* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971. p 199. Best then denies the significance of the classification by noting that the mid Victorians made more of a distinction between 'respectable' and 'non-respectable'. This distinction will be discussed later.

[12] R. Neale *Class in English History 1680-1850* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

[13] G. Crossick and H-G. Haupt *The Petty Bourgeoisie in Europe 1780-1914: Enterprize, Family, and Independence* London; Routledge, 1995.

[14] It has been suggested, most notably by Gareth Stedman-Jones, that it is important in the definition of class to distinguish between the classification applied by the observer, and the perception of the historical actor. quoted in Neale, p 102.

composed both of small retailers and small producers (or artisans). As neither term would be an appropriate tag on its own to encompass the full diversity of the class, they label it the 'petty bourgeoisie'. The employment of this term is potentially problematic, however, for it is a class term of Marxist origin.

Marxist definitions of social class centre on the social relations of production. A Marxist class consists of those with a certain relation to the means of production. The petty bourgeoisie as a class in Marxist terms should, thus, be defined by their particular productive relations. This is troublesome for Crossick and Haupt's group, for their 'petty bourgeoisie' both owned their tools (or 'capital') and contributed their 'labour' power. Consequently, in Marxist terms, they straddle the material classes of those who own the means of production, and those who are separate from them.[15] This ambiguity of productive relations implies the petty bourgeoisie were not a permanent, historical social class, but a transitional one. The contention is apparently strengthened by the diverse experience of Crossick and Haupt's class, who were socio-economically heterogeneous, socially unstable, and - under normal circumstances, exhibited a lack of political unity. In addition, the term has problematic implications of embourgeoisiement, an orientation towards bourgeois values. Though some would argue that this indeed was the case, it was not by any means an historical fait accompli.

Historians have overcome this theoretical difficulty by defining their petty bourgeoisie in non-materialist, Weberian terms instead. Weberian class, according to Neale, is a subjective consciousness of position in a set of relationships of authority and subordination. Crossick and Haupt similarly see it as one's place in the market relative to other participants. A Weberian-type social class, therefore, is not an imposed framework, as with Marxist class, but an identity derived from perceptions of social relationships. This can, therefore, integrate the disparate productive elements that trouble the Marxist definition of the petty bourgeoisie, and legitimize the diversity of Victorian class description. Neale suggests

---

[15] Crossick and Haupt, p 3

that redefinition necessitates re-labelling. He nominates 'middling class' but Crossick and Haupt persist with the term 'petty bourgeoisie', arguing that it does not lose its explanatory significance.[16]

Crossick and Haupt believe that the petty bourgeoisie developed its specific identity in relation to what they see as the key class groups of nineteenth century society, the peasant/workers, and the bourgeoisie/aristocrats.[17] The essence of this market position is the unique productive situation of the small producer and retailer. This (as we have seen) is the employment in their enterprizes of both their own capital and labour. Unlike wage earners therefore, they enter the market to sell product rather than labour power. The economic situation of the component parts of the petty bourgeoisie was therefore broadly analogous. Lacking monopolistic control, they participated in an unequal struggle with large scale enterprise. Both artisan and retailer, therefore, had a submissive relationship to the market, and were thus subject to a structural instability. Economic independence was fragile.

Experience of this core structural instability was not uniform, however, because it depended very much on the moment in time and individual circumstance. This was a consequence of the degree of economic heterogeneity that characterized the petty bourgeoisie. Most central was the incontrovertible fact that the class was composed of two groups: artisans concerned primarily with production, and shopkeepers distributing goods and services. There was, however, a good deal of interchange between the two groups, and the distinction between craft and retail was not absolute.

The petty bourgeoisie were also characterized by a broad hierarchy of economic strata: from the well-established trader or master craftsman with several employees at one end of the spectrum, to the tiny, marginal workshop or shop at the other. In between fitted a myriad of individual economic positions shaped by individual experience of trade, town,

---

[16] Neale's thinking largely parallels, in terms of logical development, that of Crossick and Haupt, but is less significant for this thesis because it focuses on the period 1800-1840, and does not argue for the perpetuation of the 'middling' class beyond this period.

[17] Crossick and Haupt, p 127

capitalization, family, skill, and particular economic juncture (such as a recession).[18] This picture was further complicated by a consequence of economic instability: a significant social and geographic mobility that engendered an unstable, fluctuating class membership.

These factors worked against a sense of common experience. Under normal circumstances, members could be oriented to either bourgeois or proletarian positions and values, and tended therefore to exhibit a lack of political unity. Yet the distinctive nature of petty bourgeois enterprise, and the common market position it imposed (insecure and ambiguous though it may have been), allowed for a certain distinctive class identity. This consciousness was most evident in times of crisis, when the coincidence of economic pressures and political anxieties motivated the petty bourgeois to act as a class. Neale considers that the particular tendencies exhibited by the petty bourgeoisie corresponded generally to the state of relations with authority. A strong petty bourgeois consciousness may occur when the relations of authority and subordination are strong, social mobility is limited, and movement to a higher social strata occurs without a corresponding increase in authority position. The political class thereby precipitated will struggle for a share of political power, although the disparate nature of the class ensures that the political response of its individual elements tends to be historically specific.[19] Crossick and Haupt suggest that in the midst of all this flux, there may have also been a stable core component that provided a basis for a more permanent form of petty bourgeois culture and organization. The petty bourgeoisie therefore existed in spite of itself.

Values

When one begins to discuss the social and political values of the mid-Victorian petty bourgeoisie, one easily gets mired in debate. These values are usually described in terms such as independence, respectability, and self-improvement, that can be broadly categorized as 'liberal'. Explanations of how the mid-Victorian petty bourgeoisie came to possess these traits depends very much on which typology of the development of mid-Victorian society one

[18] ibid, pp 72-73
[19] Neale, p 135

adheres to. Some see the values as the product of economic position, and evolving therefore from within the class. Others see them as an expression of a socio-political ideology generated by external forces. This social schemata debate will be examined below.

The basic ethos of mid-Victorian liberalism was the belief in a laissez-faire world of individual and community self government. This was expressed in terms of, and inspired by, a nostalgic idealization of peasant proprietorship. The reasoning behind this idealization, says Biagini, may seem curious in what was an increasingly urbanized and industrialized setting. He believes the idyllic 'pastoral dream', where one owned one's own land, had no landlord, and was orderly and prosperous, held kudos because of the values it was perceived to represent. In particular, these were moral and civic virtue, and a certain relationship between state and society, where society was pre-eminent. The widely held perception was that this ideal social formulation had broken down at the hands of 'land robbers' who had driven the people into the cities, where they were subject to overcrowding and unemployment.[20]

The liberal socio-political ideal, therefore, was a minimalist state and individual independence. However, in spite of the liberal concern to limit state regulation and encourage free trade, the influence of the value system of the 'pastoral dream' ensured that unlimited competition, with its potential for monopoly and domination, was also anathema.[21] It was, therefore, entirely compatible with these ideals for the state to legislate to enforce a 'normal' operation of the market.[22] The broad value consensus that provided the social glue for the curious contradictions of the mid-Victorian era was thus, according to Biagini, a 'blend of precepts and "exceptions" of classical economy with Christian moral concern'.[23]

The apparently contradictory tendencies of a state-regulated laissez-faire system, reconciled by a common ideological consensus focused on rural values but largely urban in

---

[20] E. Biagini *Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform: Popular Liberalism in the Age of Gladstone 1860-1880* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. pp 86-91, 186.
[21] ibid p 139-140
[22] ibid pp 164, 168
[23] ibid p 172.

expression, reached its most paradoxical manifestation, because of its pastoral inspiration, in the 'land question'. Land was seen as different from other forms of property because it was a limited commodity. Also contributing to the special position of land was the old radical conviction of work being the only legitimate source of property rights, which engendered an antipathy to landlordism and unearned increment. Land monopoly was perceived to be a particular danger, and regulation of ownership doubly important.

The location of the popular values of a changing Britain in the pastoral idyll ensured that solutions to the problems of a changing Britain also found inspiration in the idealization of land. One of the major Victorian problems was the prevalence amongst the workforce of semi-permanent unemployment. This was aggravated by the regular and extreme fluctuations of the trade cycle, which precipitated periods of mass unemployment. Voluntarist remedies appeared totally inadequate to deal with the problem. The long-term solution was perceived to be threefold. Extraordinary public works were one immediate sop for the labour surplus, but definitive answers were sought in the countryside through redistributive land reform. The concept of 'home colonization' was popular.[24] Emigration too, though not always immediately precipitated by hardship, was inspired by the possibility of achieving the 'pastoral dream' of independence on the land. In this context, Biagini sees it as a form of social protest.[25]

These values, says Biagini, reached their popular apogee in, and thus principally defined, the political and social ideals of what he calls the 'artisan' class. Crossick and Haupt see the values as homogenizing the petty bourgeoisie. Ostensibly Biagini's artisans are not coterminous with Crossick and Haupt's petty bourgeoisie, for the former could include skilled wage earners and exclude retailers. However, as a proportion of artisans were petty bourgeois, and because Biagini does not closely define 'artisan', the difference may be seen to be more one of terminology than substance.

---

[24] ibid p 184-188
[25] ibid p 90

Crossick and Haupt explain that the ideal form of independence through property ownership was lauded by the petty bourgeoisie because, in a world marked by inherent instability, it held moral and social significance as a representation of the attainment of independence, autonomy, and security. In the early-nineteenth century, the petty bourgeois concept of property focused on more intangible values. The right to live by one's own efforts, and to sustain systems of moral and economic control which defended this right, were perceived broadly as 'property'. At mid-century, however, the values of the class underwent a shift, and the meaning of property changed. A more individualistic conception came to prevail, and property became limited to that that could be bought and sold.[26] In particular, the petty bourgeoisie expressed a preference for 'real' property - land and buildings - as opposed to 'personal' property such as shares and loans. This real property was usually small scale, urban, and local.[27] The hegemony of this new narrow definition was not total, however, and the two meanings of property coexisted to a degree.[28] For most class members however, independence remained more an ambition than a reality. Many achieved a partial independence in their urban setting through means such as in co-operatives and friendly societies.[29]

Closely related to their attachment to property was another defining aspect of petty bourgeois culture: localism. The urban environment was central to the creation of their identity. The petty bourgeoisie possessed a strong attachment to locality that was a function of their social, cultural, and economic concerns. They were central figures in their neighbourhoods, providing goods and services, employment, rental housing, institutions of sociability, and political and social leadership. This localism, and a desire to secure their interests led to an involvement in municipal government, where the petty bourgeoisie had a major role in Britain. Their social weight, however, was generally too light for the petty

---

[26] Crossick and Haupt p 148
[27] ibid p 204
[28] ibid p 148. The significance of property for the Christchurch sample group is dealt with in chapter 4.
[29] Crossick and Haupt, pp 9, 61; Biagini *Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform* (1992), p 139-40

bourgeoisie to project themselves politically on the state.[30] This leading role placed the petty bourgeoisie in a dichotomous position, however. For although they were anchored economically and socially within the broad 'working class' community in which they dwelt, and tended to identify with the same 'popular' values, they also formed an elite culturally separate from that community.[31]

Another of the central characteristics that the economic instability of the petty bourgeoisie and their desire for an independence encouraged was a family-centredness. The organization and scale of petty bourgeois enterprize, with the employment of both capital and labour, encouraged the integration of family into business. The family became the centre of petty bourgeois economic activity. This family-centredness was encouraged by a concentration of attention on fewer children, a concern for respectability that distanced the class from the mass culture of the working class, and a spatial link between business and private space, where, for reasons of functionality and affordability, there was little differentiation.

The mid-Victorian formulation of liberalism, the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie, was a belief in a laissez-faire world of individual and community independence. This was expressed with most conviction in the urban environment, but was informed by the idealization of peasant proprietorship because of the ideal values attributed to that condition. The complex of values which contributed to this identification could paradoxically justify state regulation in some areas and deregulation in others, to ensure that the most accurate representation of the desired typology of independence was achieved. This was demonstrated particularly by the liberal attitude to land, where the perception of a fundamental correlation between it and the achievement of independence precipitated calls for the most stringent regulation of ownership.

Socio-political Schemata

---

[30] Biagini *Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform* (1992), p 12) considers that the decentralizing influence of 'Old [religious] Dissent' on working class radicals engendered participation at a municipal level, but at the expense of a wariness and non-participation in central government.

[31] Crossick and Haupt p 220

This section demonstrates that explanations of the development of the social and political values of the mid Victorian petty bourgeoisie are widely variant. Although not comprehensive, the discussion highlights the different approaches of some of the leading historians on the era. British Victorian society is widely perceived to have evolved over the period between the 1830s and the 1860s from a state of class conflict predicated on 'radical' values, to a class consensus predicated on 'liberal' values. There are two much debated aspects concerning this apparent transition. The first is the actual nature of the change in class dynamics that typified the period, and the second is the nature of the change in values that brought about this change in class dynamics.

The nature of the changing class dynamic and changing class values has been the subject of debate primarily because of the diversity of mid-Victorian class definition employed both historically, and by historians. Consequently, there has been interminable argument about what class is moving where, how, and why. In most cases this is simply an issue of terminology rather than any great difference of interpretation. If it is accepted that the 'petty bourgeoisie' existed as a discrete class entity, and were the pivot in this social transition, then the debate is reducible to two broad options.

The first of these is that the petty bourgeoisie became separated from the proletarian element of a popular milieu formerly united by a radical value system, and were subsequently incorporated into the liberal bourgeoisie. The validity of this position depends on the assertion of a discontinuity of values: that 'radical' and 'liberal' mean two quite different things. This is the 'discontinuity' thesis. The second approach to account for the changing nature of the class dynamic is that the petty bourgeoisie substantially maintained their class position, but that either or both of the two classes surrounding the petty bourgeoisie shifted ground ideologically, in relative terms, thereby changing class relations. The validity of this position depends on the assertion of a continuity of values: that 'radical' and 'liberal' meant fundamentally the same thing. This, therefore, is the 'continuity' thesis. There are also some

intermediate positions, that show that the two positions are not necessarily mutually exclusive.[32]

Discontinuity

The discontinuity thesis has, according to Biagini, been the dominant interpretation. Some prominent proponents include Neale, and Best. Biagini implies that Hamer is also an advocate of the discontinuity thesis, though this is determined by inference, for Hamer does not develop a comprehensive historical scheme. Hamer and Neale offer what are primarily dialectical materialist (ie. mechanistic) explanations of discontinuity, though differing on immediate historical direction. Both their explanations accept the fundamental nature of class struggle because of the antithetical nature of class interests, and are therefore underscored by a certain ahistorical inevitability.[33] By contrast, Best gives a 'social' explanation, with more room for the action of agency.

According to Biagini, both the discontinuity and continuity theses consider that during the first half of the nineteenth century, the petty bourgeoisie were politically and socially united with the wage earning working class in the value system of 'popular radicalism'. The petty bourgeoisie took the leading role in the political advocacy of these radical ideas, and were therefore the most significant political class in the period to 1840.[34] This popular radicalism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was a social critique predicated on power, not class. Its typology set the useful and productive 'people' against the rich (and ipso facto the parasitic and unproductive), who monopolized political power. The assumption was that those with power were corrupt, and used it to entrench monopoly and speculation. Radicalism therefore sought representative government through

---

[32] The idea of a continuity/discontinuity divide is derived from Biagini *Currents of Radicalism* (1991), pp 1-2.

[33] The rendering of Hamer as a dialectical materialist is a personal interpretation based on both D. Hamer (*Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Roseberry: A Study in Leadership and Policy* Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1972. and *The New Zealand Liberals: The Years of Power* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1988), and Biagini's examination of Hamer. (*Currents of Radicalism,* 1991).

[34] Neale p 135

democratic suffrage, civil and religious liberty, and public secular education. Thus it was a populist, political, and moral vision, not an economic and proletarian one.

After the mid 1830s, however, the subjectively defined popular radical consensus began to break down. A paradigm shift took place at this time that seems to have ideologically and culturally separated it out into its two socio-economic class fragments; the proletarian and the petty bourgeois. The discontinuists understand, however, that the petty bourgeois component, was moved closer to the social and political values of the middle class at this time, becoming part of a subjective popular liberal consensus. The Chartist period is, therefore, seen as the last burst of 'working class' or 'popular' radicalism before the triumph of 'middle class values' as embodied in political and economic liberalism, and social reformism. What followed was a period of political and social quiescence from 1850 to the 1880s, when the petty bourgeoisie apparently absorbed the hegemonic 'apolitical' ideology of improvement and self-help, and in Britain, voted for the 'apolitical' Liberal Party.

Hamer's apparently materialist view of discontinuity sees this so-called 'working class' liberalism as a deviation from the dialectic of history. He believes that whereas radical values were directly applicable to the welfare of the 'working class', liberal values were not. The political manifestation ('Liberalism') of liberal values attracted 'working class' adherants because it had only a symbolic and psychological meaning. Actual political outcome was immaterial. According to Hamer, therefore, the liberal consensus was founded on the illogical denial of class difference.[35] The inference of this perspective is that the petty bourgeoisie, as a portion of the 'working class', would inevitably be detached from the popular liberal milieu, and rejoined with the proletariat to satisfy the pressure for two great historical classes.

There are problems with Hamer's discontinuity thesis, as Biagini perceives it. The central difficulty may be its failure to clearly account for the temporary transition to liberal

---

[35] Hamer argues that Liberal politics were not governed by any particular or relevant system of thought that was capable of guiding political practice. Without any core principle or belief therefore, liberal politics tended towards incoherence. *Liberal Politics* 1972, pp xi, 18, and Biagini *Currents of Radicalism* 1991, pp 1-5.

values. Biagini is critical of what he regards as Hamer's failure to admit a critical political consciousness amongst the formerly radical constituents of the new popular liberal consensus of mid-nineteenth century Britain. He appeals to the recovery of contemporary political context. Why, he asks, would such apparently irrational political behaviour have prevailed in an age of increasing levels of information and political discussion? Liberal achievements for the good of the 'working class' were, he points out, very real. Biagini's implication is that the 'working class' were fully conscious and approving of their Liberal hue because of its close correlation with radicalism.[36]

Biagini also sees the identification of the component of the 'working class' that became attached to the middle class as a problematic element of Hamer's thesis. The idea of discontinuity, believes Biagini, depends largely on the idea of the embourgeoisiement of a new 'labour aristocracy' - which he feels is unsustainable.[37] This criticism loses its significance, however, if the idea of a labour aristocracy is replaced by that of the petty bourgeoisie.

In a similar fashion to Hamer, Neale suggests a materialist explanation of the historical development of the petty bourgeoisie, predicated on discontinuity. Unlike Hamer, however, Neale specifically distinguishes a petty bourgeois social category that he calls the 'middling class'. In the same manner that Hamer had inferred that his 'working class' were temporarily estranged from their appropriate (and useful class consciousness), so Neale argues that his 'middling' class were not an historical class, but a distinct group in transition from one great historical class to another. He believes that the 'middling class' were necessarily transitional because they lacked a consciousness 'which could culminate in a compacted collectivist class consciousness'. Ultimately the class was destined to be over taken by the advance of industrialisation and the emergence of other classes and other class consciousness.[38] Where Neale and Hamer substantially differ, however, is that Hamer

---

[36] Biagini *Currents of Radicalism* 1991, p 6.
[37] ibid p 4
[38] Neale p 150

seems to suggest that the 'working class' would eventually return in its entirety to their proletarian historical niche.[39] Neale, by contrast, believed that it was the conjoining of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie that was transitional, and that the popular liberal milieu was the historical niche of the 'middling class', as part of a greater bourgeoisie.

Despite Neale's identification of a petty bourgeoisie, there are problems with the application of his theory to the mid-Victorian period. Neale's explanation of the emergence of the petty bourgeoisie as a political class is centred on the radical experience of the 1830s and 1840s.[40] Although he identifies the petty bourgeois 'middling class' as a self aware, political class at this time, he does not allow for the sustained maintenance of a separate identity from the middle class (or bourgeoisie) after the end of Chartism. And like Hamer, nor does Neale effectively indicate how the radical values of the 'middling class' were subsumed (or overwhelmed) by what were ostensibly the values of the middle class.

Unlike Neale and Hamer, Best provides a clear explanation for the discontinuity of values. This he bases primarily on the idea on bourgeois co-option. Best depicts the liberal consensus as resting on a broad acceptance of the hierarchical social order, and a common culture of the personal qualities of respectability and independence. The bourgeois social order was accepted because of a new belief that inequalities were surmountable through a cultivation of these 'socially soothing' traits.[41] Conflating the two concepts of respectability and independence on the basis of the Victorian association of divinity and economics, Best sees their origins in the liberal doctrine of free choice, where the process of choice was seen to teach practical morality. Respectability, Best defines as a style of living showing proper respect for morals and morality that was usually but not necessarily Christian. As the emulation of a sufficient facade of respectability was beyond the means of the poor, they

---

[39] Hamer *Liberal Politics* 1972, p 9.

[40] Neale considers that the British "working class" became particularly politically radical and revolutionary in the 1830s because of a unique confluence of circumstance. Beginning to suffer from the emergence and competition of large capital, the class united on the traditional radical perception that the source of their blocked aspiration was oppression by aristocratic power and privilege, to which they were naturally antagonistic. p 150

[41] Best pp 232, 236

were excluded from its practice. It was thus the sharpest of all lines of social division, signifying as it did intrinsic virtue and social value. It was not, however, an absolute, coming in a variety of styles and levels. Independence was the accommodation of expenditure to income, necessary to the formation of a respectable life style. It was predicated on the dictum that it was immoral to depend upon anything other than ones own resource's. This led to the sanctification of 'self help', and the vilification of dependence, where the humiliating inference was that those who could not remain independent were morally defective and not entitled to respect. Together, the values of respectability and independence acted in concert to separate the working (or rather 'popular radical') class into two mutually exclusive and potentially antagonistic factions.[42]

With the acceptance by the upper strata of the 'labouring classes' of the values of their social superiors - economic individualism, independence, and respectability - social dissidence was minimal. There was, however, an alternative system to these consensual values: a proletarian culture of comradeship and improvidence. Both systems tended to mingle and conflict; Best sees this in the ambiguous language of trade unions.[43] Best's conclusions do not follow from his premises, however, for he notes from the mid 1860s a 'determined and effective reappearance upon the political stage of a distinctively working class organization'. How could this be, if the social base of such action had been subverted by middle class values?[44] He does not allow for the possibility that the language of radicalism had coexisted with its liberal sibling as an alternative discourse, to be invoked if the hegemonic liberal discourse of the bourgeois proved too overbearing.

Continuity

The continuity thesis is promulgated by (amongst others) Biagini, Crossick and Haupt, Joyce, and Parry. Biagini, and Crossick and Haupt offer a political explanation of the continuity, but differ over the separation of the popular radical milieu.

---

[42] ibid pp 256-263
[43] ibid pp 267-268
[44] ibid p 283

Biagini favours an interpretation emphasizing a socio-political continuity. He depicts a continuum of political radicalism that persisted throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. A change did take place after mid century, but is not seen by Biagini as the embourgeoisiement of the lower classes that the discontinuists suggest; rather it was a change in attitude of the upper classes. Political Liberalism was, according to Biagini, the 'institutionalization of an older and genuinely plebeian tradition', and was supported because it offered convincing solutions to the problems that concerned the working class. Implicit in this plebeian tradition was a factor which Biagini terms 'Old Dissent'. This he considers to be a central part of the cultural and intellectual inheritance of the British left. It inspired and strengthened the decentralizing emphasis of radicalism and liberalism. There was, thus, some ingrained hostility among the popular radical leaders to state interference in the self organisation of working people. This perhaps indicates the limits of the apparent value convergence between the governing bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. As a corollary, however, there was less hostility to government action at a municipal level, and traditional radical values and programmes for political and social democracy merged into what Biagini terms 'municipal socialism'.[45]

Crossick and Haupt are also advocates of the concept of a continuity of values, and thus the idea of a middle class accommodation. Like the advocates of discontinuity, they depict a value divergence amongst the constituent parts of the popular radical milieu - though without the same degree of historical inevitability. Unlike those who argue for discontinuity, however, Crossick and Haupt, like Biagini (and Tholfsen, below), perceive that the petty bourgeoisie held fast to their radical convictions. Crossick and Haupt perceive the paradigm shift to liberalism to be an indirect outcome of the popular radical discourse of Chartism. They depict a failure of the radical discourse to continue to appeal to the working class, paralleled by the increasing appeal of the liberal discourse to the petty bourgeoisie. The popular discourse of Chartism was ostensibly radical, with a primary concern for the

---

[45] Biagini *Currents of Radicalism* 1991, pp 10-12

distribution of power. Crossick and Haupt consider, however, that it also introduced new elements such as the language of class and a separate working class identity, that the petty bourgeoisie found uncongenial. This trend became marked after about 1848 as the working class constituents of the popular milieu became increasingly proletarianized. With the political landscape shifting around them, the petty bourgeoisie and their old radical discourse were inexorably repositioned on the right. This trend was encouraged by the formal incorporation of the petty bourgeoisie into political life after municipal and parliamentary reforms in the 1830s. Crossick and Haupt suggest also that the liberal political ideology held by the bourgeoisie was predicated on a form of consensual equalitarianism that appealed to the radical temperament of the petty bourgeoisie .[46]

Joyce also proposes a continuity thesis in his re-creation of the intellectual world of the working man in the second half of the nineteenth century. He considers the nature of populism and class, their relationship, and that with (and between) the competing ideologies of radicalism and liberalism. He draws parallels between the two ideologies of liberalism and radicalism with particular regard to their concept of class, which he sees as a product of an omnipresent vein of populism.[47] He concludes that mid-Victorian society was ideologically heterogeneous, with both 'popular' and class interpretations existing concurrently as valid depictions of society - though the 'popular' was still favoured in preference to a nascent class conception.

In the same fashion as most other theorists, Joyce identifies radicalism as a non-class dialogue, defined by the 'controlling narrative' of a notion of dispossession and exclusion. This narrative manifested itself in a political form as a concern with lost rights and liberties.[48] Also contributing to the composition of the dialogue were notions of the past, of

---

[46] Crossick and Haupt pp 133-165. They appear to suggest that the petty bourgeoisie made a smooth transition to liberalism because the ideology already embodied the radical values of anti-privilege and dissent (pp 151, 153). This claim however seems excessive. It is possible to argue that the petty bourgeoisie made liberalism their own by imposing their value system on it.

[47] P. Joyce *Visions of the People; Industrial England and the Question of Class 1840-1914* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. p 30. Joyce draws on the work of Stedman-Jones and Tholfsen, amongst others.

[48] ibid pp 329, 331

religion, and a utopian impulse. Implicit in the radical construction was the idea of the 'natural right', the perception that all social relations were organic.

Liberalism by contrast, says Joyce, proclaimed a 'moral right', invoking a religious sensibility and a social relativity. But as the successor to the discourse of radicalism, it was in many respects based on a radical heritage which it partially utilized, promulgating the idea of independence, for example. Joyce argues that liberalism still shared radicalism's political explanation of oppression, and a politically predicated desire to transcend class.[49] The desire for class union, Joyce attributes to a current of classical populism that flowed through the era of political radicalism and on into liberalism. The chief characteristics of populism were the deification of a golden age, and a resolute anti-statism. As a consequence, both conceptions of society expressed a common sense of exclusion and struggle against privilege. Divergence took place over their respective concepts of the state and political institutions, however.[50]

For Joyce, therefore, the idea of a working class with identifiably discrete interests is a tenuous construction in the absence of a well-defined class consciousness, especially when the tendency to extra-class co-operation was as great as that to conflict.[51] Having thus dismissed traditional materialist and sectional definitions of class as an effective explanatory medium, he embraces a more universal definition linked to populism and applicable to both radicalism and liberalism. This version equates class with the term 'people'. Its limits were defined by the distinctions of morality and social status, drawing a broad distinction between 'rough' and 'respectable' cultures. The criteria were sufficiently non-prescriptive and situation-specific that Joyce considers the application of a dividing line to bisect the working class by simple material criteria to be unproductive. This early and mid-Victorian 'classless' view of class was, says Joyce, socially inclusive, and stigmatised any narrower view of class. Class in the sectional modern sense began to make its presence felt from the 1860s, however.[52] The problem with Joyce's view is that, despite his best intentions, he does not

---

[49] ibid pp 54-55
[50] ibid pp 68-70
[51] ibid p 3
[52] ibid p 329, 332, 335, 340

manage to differentiate the rhetoric from reality. Therefore he does not allow for the very real ideological divide between a liberal petty bourgeoisie, and a liberal bourgeoisie.

In considering the chief factors which constituted the intellectual baggage of the average liberal working man of the late 1860s and early 1870s, Parry perceives a complete continuity. Gladstonian Liberalism, Parry sees as having grown from the popular radicalism of the 1860s, which was grounded in the 'desire to challenge the aristocracy's tenure of debilitating material privileges, and diminish legislative and financial impediments to the dignity, comfort, and spiritual progress of working men'.[53] Parry is unusual in his attribution of the values of a period as late as the 1860s to popular radicalism, when most fellow theorists consider this well after the transition to liberalism. This may be a consequence of the failure of Parry to differentiate the genesis of liberal values from the appearance of political Liberalism. Alternatively, it might be an indication of Parry's belief in the continuity of radical values through the mid-Victorian period. The general assertion of independence and dignity that was the radical-liberal formulation was expressed through dialogues of labour, religious exclusiveness, and land. The three schools of thought Parry outlines as the significant contributors to this discourse, that was neither overtly socialist nor laissez-faire, are non conformity, positivism and Gladstonianism. All three have both political and moral dimensions, and therefore contribute to the ideal of a spiritually and socially well regulated polity. Nonconformity was particularly significant in politicising the workingman, because its practice attested to the dignity and independence of labour.[54]

Intermediate Positions

Stedman-Jones and Tholfsen draw from both sides of the continuity/discontinuity divide, and thus occupy the middle ground. They draw differentially from each camp,

---

[53] Gladstone saw this as a means of reinvigorating government, attacking corruption, defending denominationalism, promoting evangelism, and thus forestalling pressure for fundamental constitutional or fiscal change. It was therefore fundamentally conservative rather than revolutionary in intent. See Parry p 451.

[54] ibid pp 232, 238. Positivism and Gladstonianism were related to the role of nonconformity. Positivism was the belief that spiritual power must be separated from the temporal, whilst Gladstonianism decreed that no man possessed the authority to impose their views on any other.

however, and reach different conclusions. Stedman-Jones's analysis is primarily a discontinuity argument, moderated by elements of continuity. By contrast, Tholfsen's analysis is more a continuity argument.

Tholfsen, an early theorist, adopts what is ostensibly a continuity argument, but integrates it with elements of the discontinuity argument. What results is an intermediate position. Tholfsen predicated his thesis on a value convergence, but unlike Stedman-Jones (below), on the basis of a middle class adaptation to and incorporation of petty bourgeois values, not vice versa. In contrast with Stedman-Jones, Tholfsen considers that the articulation of radical values survived the decline of Chartism, but in an attenuated form within a hegemony of 'consensus' values predicated on middle-class dominance. The central focus of the consensus package was a concern with moral and intellectual improvement. According to Tholfsen, the consensus had its origins in the shared assumptions of working-class radicalism and middle class liberalism, both descendants of the values of eighteenth-century enlightenment liberalism: equality and liberty. Divergence in the interpretation of these values took place in the early 1800's, followed by an historical re-convergence at mid century.

Before 1830, Tholfsen finds that radicalism was defined (once again) primarily by the pursuit of political rights. Disparate social groups were thus able to unite under the populist plebeian banner of 'the people' in common opposition to political domination. This emphasis on aristocratic privilege and 'old corruption' served to distract radicals from confrontation with the increasingly antagonistic values of middle-class liberalism.[55]

During the 1830s, a new self-righteous middle-class consciousness precipitated a working-class (or rather, a 'popular') consciousness. The middle-class interpretation of enlightenment values had evolved into a belief in laissez-faire individualism and economic freedom. Expressed in the form of the socially deterministic utilitarian political economy, it

---

[55] T. Tholfsen *Working Class Radicalism in Mid Victorian England* London: Croom Helm, 1976. pp 50-51

came to rationalize and justify middle-class social and economic pre-eminence and the suppression of working-class aspiration. The Chartist response was thus stimulated.[56]

The popular radical response to this form of domination was the assertion of equality. Predicated on an internally inconsistent polyglot of religious and secular, rationalistic and romantic ideals, the popular defence centred on the ethic of individual self-improvement. Intellectual and moral improvement was held to be an intrinsic good, the proclamation of self worth seen as an a priori means of advancing liberty and resisting the moralistic aspect of middle-class oppression. Radicals felt that the inferiority and servility of the working class had become entrenched through the deprivation of their moral and intellectual development. It was to be this very emphasis of this resistance, however, that was to lead to the mid-Victorian consensus.[57]

In the face of the radical challenge by Chartism during the 1830s and 1840s, middle-class liberalism mellowed and adapted to create a more benign social philosophy. Instead of blatantly suppressing the working class and denying them development, the middle class came to play the radicals on their own ground. Emphasis shifted to a more subtle form of domination, educating the working class to an understanding and acceptance of their position within the analysis of political economy. To this end liberalism captured the initiative with regard to the secular faith of self improvement, redirecting it to the promulgation of the values of social harmony rather than resistance.[58]

The middle class thus strengthened and extended their authority by casting in their own image the universal values lauded by mid-Victorian society at large, thereby muting the grounds for conflict and encouraging consensus. The reinterpretation of self-improvement saw the evolution of the cult of respectability. This equated the values of subordination, deference, and materialism with moral superiority. The improvement ethic was constantly reinforced by social affirmation through the exaltation of aspiration and progress. This could

---

[56] ibid pp 28, 43, 48
[57] ibid pp 61-66, 83
[58] ibid pp 124, 130-140

take sentimental and ceremonial form, and also saw the middle class assume personal leadership of the effort to elevate the working class. With this in mind, the middle class undertook to glorify the 'respectable' working man, and on a superficial level identify with that image. Also acting as a reinforcer of appropriate values was the education system, which functioned as a means of indoctrination.[59]

Within the improvement-defined perameters of this consensus discourse, however, a degree of class confrontation remained over the exact interpretation of these universal values. 'Working class' or 'popular' radicalism persistently rejected the hierarchical liberal formulation of the middle class, in favour of an attenuated version of old radical values that was egalitarian and populist, but without the impetus for social transformation. Consequently it expressed a curious juxtaposition of militancy and consensuality. This stubborn ideological residuum emanated, says Tholfsen, from the aesthetic of a working-class sub-culture. However, he continues, a successful defence of the working-class version against incursion of the middle-class version necessitated an idealization of the values of the working-class subculture. This made it vulnerable to a subtle acculturation with the middle-class values that sentimentalized and trivialized the radical ideals.[60]

Tholfsen believes that a number of institutions of working class origin expressed the tension between the working-class and middle-class versions. Trade Unions, for example, resisted middle-class hegemony by utilizing the established paradigm to assert the value of the working-class. In so doing, however, radicalism was encouraged and social harmony disrupted. Friendly Societies, by contrast, expressed working-class commitment to consensus and social harmony, and acted to reinforce the consensus through active association with the middle-class, by contrasting the behaviour of insiders and outsiders, by creating an internal hierarchy, and by promoting self-made men within the organization.

---

[59] ibid pp 197, 217, 227
[60] ibid pp 243-245

However the sub-textual class tension was expressed even here, in a resentment at non-recognition by the middle-class.[61]

Unlike the discontinuists Hamer and Neale, Stedman-Jones offers not a historical materialist, but a political explanation for the transition to liberalism. It features the co-option argument usually used to explain discontinuity, but also assimilates the accommodation argument, which usually supports the continuity thesis. Stedman-Jones' explanation is predicated on the failure of the radical discourse of Chartism to bind the popular milieu together. In this case, however, the separation was not prompted by the rise of different class values among the working-class (or proletarian) and petty bourgeois constituents, but rather by the failure of radical values for the popular milieu in general. Stedman-Jones believes, as the others do, that Chartism was a politically predicated radical social critique, not an economically predicated class-conscious analysis.[62] The break-down of Chartist support, and the apparent slide into the period of mid-Victorian quiescence was not, however, according to Stedman-Jones, a capitulation to the individualist values of middle-class liberal ideology (nor a modification of these values), but rather a failure of the radical political language of Chartism to be a viable explanatory medium of the source of discontent. This failure was initiated because the success of the radical ideology of the Chartist depended on the identification of the propertied elite as the source of oppression, through the convincing assignation of material afflictions such as employment and low wages to political causes. However, the changing character and policies of the state challenged the radical explanation; and with the contrasting fortunes of various trades becoming evident, and distress less generally pervasive, then as Stedman-Jones puts it, radical ideology 'lost purchase'.[63] The effective raising of the state above the exigencies of economic self-interest confounded a Chartist critique that was unable to comprehend that legislation could serve

---

[61] ibid pp 276-277
[62] Stedman-Jones p 107*Language of Class: Studies in English Working Class History 1832-1982* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
[63] ibid p 105-107

other than partisan class purpose.[64] And as the critique was not predicated on productive relations, it had no independent rationale for antagonism to the middle class. For Stedman-Jones therefore, Chartism was a last stand for the traditional radical critique of society. Consequently the devaluing of its explanatory capacity opened the way for a convergence of social values between the two classes. To this extent, Stedman-Jones is a discontinuist.

However, he also considers that the co-option by the middle-class of the working-class, and the discontinuity of values that this entailed, was not complete. According to Stedman-Jones, the middle class had a great fear of 'working-class' disorder, and desired therefore to ameliorate the potential for such disorder through the promotion of Christianizing and 'civilizing' initiatives. Two stratagems were used to this end: the legislative, to create a physical and institutional environment to deter working-class habits and attitudes; and private philanthropy, to actively propagate the desired moral code. He locates a peak period of such religious and philanthropic energy during what he calls the 'uneasy years' of 1866-72.[65] Stedman-Jones, however, distinguishes what he calls a distinctive 'artisanal' political culture: secularist, republican, democratic, and anti-aristocratic - in other words the traditional radical culture of the petty bourgeoisie.[66] This intellectual and social independence meant that many of the middle-class endeavours to project their values were ultimately destined to be limited in scope and/or penetration. Temperance and nonconformity served as comparatively effective vehicles of value transmission; but even these were of a limited, narrow, significance.[67] Respectability, he says, was adopted for appearances sake rather than for any other abiding commitment.[68] The inference, thus, is the same as that made by Joyce: that the discourses of

---

[64] ibid pp 177-178
[65] ibid pp 190-191
[66] ibid p 185
[67] ibid p 198
[68] ibid p 201. Interestingly, he considers that this passive resistance to middle class imperialism eventually degenerated to the point at which, in the last quarter of the century, working class culture eschewed its own radical, activist, and self improving traditions for a hedonistic and vacuous junket of pleasure and amusement. This was the product of a number of longer term social and economic factors, but particularly because of the integration of Chartist demands into the platform of political liberalism, which deprived the working class of its direction and leadership. See pp 208, 215, and 222.

radicalism and liberalism existed side by side, or that liberalism was a thin veneer on the 'Old Dissent' of radicalism.

Conclusion

The depiction of the 'middle' sector of mid Victorian society is been extensively contested territory. The debate centres on two problems. One problem has been the selection of a suitable definition. Both historical and contemporary recognition and labelling have not always represented the class accurately. This is partly a problem of subjective and objective definitions of class. Subjective historical categories were multiple, and were often applied simultaneously. The contemporary term that best fits the objectively apparent socio-economic class is a Weberian 'petty bourgeoisie'. The market-centred Weberian definition defines this group as a class in spite of its very great economic diversity. The relationship of the petty bourgeois to the market defines a particular coherent set of social values. Most prominent among these is that of independence; all other values, such as respectability and equality, being ancillary to this. The Canterbury Working Man's Association and the Canterbury Freehold Land Society appear to be representative of this petty bourgeois culture in mid Victorian Christchurch. The second problem has been the explanation of the historical development of the class. One argument holds that there was a continuity of values through the early and mid-Victorian periods; the other a discontinuity. The continuity argument seems tentatively more sustainable - though this does not necessarily discredit all facets of the discontinuity argument.

CHAPTER 2: OCCUPATIONS

This chapter looks at the occupations and employment experience of the members of the Canterbury Working Man's Association and the Canterbury Freehold Land Society and compares this with the employment experience of the Western European petty bourgeoisie, and the expectations of the mid-Victorians as they related to unemployment. It looks particularly at the partially contracting rural economy in Canterbury in the mid and late 1860s, and the urban employment problems and agitations consequent upon this. It may be that the two organizations that are the focus of this thesis were formed at least partly in response to these difficult economic circumstances.

Employment Character

The means of employment of the petty bourgeoisie was their distinguishing characteristic. It was this particularity that gave them a common identity, and defined them as a 'class'. The livelihood of the petty bourgeoisie depended fundamentally on the employment of their own capital *and* labour. Therefore they occupied an analogous market position. This structural relation engendered a common character in petty bougeoise enterprize: primarily a basic structural instability, and a submissive relation to a market led by the bourgeois. Independence was fragile because of the way in which such enterprize operated. Under-capitalization and debt were common. Similarly, the petty bourgeoisie were dependent on markets over which they exercised a minimum of control.[1]

Experience of this basic insecurity was however to some degree dependent on particular economic exigencies, and individual situation. The petty bourgeoisie were economically diverse and dispersed over different sectors of production and distribution. There were hierarchies of size, prosperity, and enterprize.[2] In many cases the petty bourgeois were neither wholly independent artisans nor shopkeepers, but a combination of both. Many crafts people retailed their produce (e.g. tailors and shoemakers), and retailers

---

[1] G. Crossick and H-G Haupt, pp 9, 217-218. This analysis is based particularly on the British and Northern European petty bourgeoisie. There is little reason to believe that the equivalent class in New Zealand would differ substantially.

[2] ibid pp 72-73

were crafts people (e.g. bakers and butchers).[3] Rural small enterprize in England was still characterised at mid-century by 'pluri-activity', where trade income was supplemented by a small holding.[4] Crossick and Haupt assert, thus, that the boundary between artisan and shopkeeper was frequently crossed, and believe the distinction between retail and craft to have been too sharply drawn.[5] This diversity also raises the issue of the placement of class boundaries, especially that between the petty bourgeoisie and the lower middle class.

Generally, however, those trades with a high level of technical skill and substantial capital displayed greater stability than those needing small initial capital and rudimentary training. It was drapers and ironmongers rather than general shopkeepers or green grocers who constituted the elite of the retail sector in Britain.[6] Some small enterprizes were particularly dependent on consumer demand, and therefore more unstable. In this sector, which included tailors, shoemakers, cabinet makers, and manufacturers of small metal goods, a short term difficulty could rapidly escalate into a crisis.[7]

Occupational Background

In 1866, Lady Barker remarked of Christchurch that 'Very few people live in the town except the trades people...'.[8] It is difficult, though, to estimate the size of the petty bourgeoisie. Of the total provincial population of 53, 866 people in 1867, five percent were involved in trade, commerce, and manufacture, and six percent were mechanics, artificers, or skilled labourers.[9] Canterbury had at 1,321, more people involved in manufacturing than any other province.[10] Many, if not the vast majority of these workingmen would have lived in Christchurch, for in 1868, 23,245 people or half the population of the province were living in and around the city - in the Christchurch, Avon, Heathcote, and Lyttelton general

---

[3] ibid p 8
[4] ibid p 57
[5] ibid p 8
[6] ibid p 219
[7] ibid p 55
[8] Lady M. Barker *Station Life in New Zealand* Christchurch: Whitcomb and Tombs, 1950. p 46.
[9] appendix 2, fig 3
[10] ibid, fig 4

electorates.[11] If one allows for wives and dependants, the greater proportion of Christchurch's population must have been petty bourgeois.

An examination of the occupations of the members of two Christchurch-based organizations, the Canterbury Working Man's Association (1865-6) and a splinter group, the Canterbury Freehold Land Society (1866-70), reveals a distinct petty bourgeois character.[12] The occupations of sixteen of the eighteen identified members of the WMA and thirty-three of the forty-eight identified members of the FLS have been ascertained. These organisations were comprised mainly of small, independent proprietors. The Working Man's Association had perhaps a slightly greater proportion of artisans in its ranks than had the Freehold Land Society which, in addition to a greater diversity of occupations, may have had a slight preponderance of retailers. It is difficult, however, to be certain from the small sample. A core few took leadership roles in both organizations. Membership from the professions, large merchants, or unskilled labour is either insignificant or absent.[13] The members of the two bodies exhibited many of the features of the petty bourgeoisie that Crossick and Haupt distinguish. Firstly, they occupied a wide range of occupations in both the retail and trade sectors, and a wide range of positions on the socio-economic spectrum - from the 'owner operator' through to substantial employers such as W. H. Barnes, whose foundry was one of the larger employers in the city, and nurseryman William Wilson, a significant property investor.[14] In terms of defining a class, this variation is potentially problematic. However, personal identification with the group rather than the absolute size of one's enterprize - or even one's exact employment status - seemed to mark the boundaries of the class. Size also seemed to provide little security against the common petty bourgeois affliction of chronic

---

[11] W. Scotter 'Canterbury, 1857-68: The Superintendencies of W. S Moorhouse (1857-63; 1866-68), and S. Bealey (1863-66)' W. J. Gardner (ed) *A History of Canterbury: Vol. II ; General History 1854-76, and Cultural Aspects 1850-1950* Christchurch: Canterbury Centennial Historical and Literary Committee/Whitcomb and Tombs, 1971. pp 233, 243; appendix 2, fig. 2: (1867 census).

[12] See appendix 1, figs. 2 and 6, 7, and 8; appendix 2, figs 3 and 4.

[13] For comment on those members who were in occupations unable to be labelled "petty bourgeois", see chapter 5.

[14] All unsourced biographical information in this thesis is derived from the *MacDonald Dictionary of Canterbury Biography* Canterbury Museum (unpub).

economic instability. At least twelve members (including Barnes) are recorded as suffering bankruptcy during the 1860s and 1870s. The typicality of instability is suggested by the frequent career changes, and movement between (or conjunction of) trade and retail, that characterized the membership.

Crossick and Haupt point out that some occupations were unstable because of the low level of training and capital required. They were easy to enter, and therefore prone to over competition. General shopkeepers belonged in this category. Other occupations were unstable because they were acutely sensitive to changes in demand. Tailors, cabinet-makers, shoemakers and iron-ware makers belonged to this group. Subject to both problems, and particularly unstable, were the trades of the construction industry: such as contractors, carpenters, cabinet-makers, plasterers, and painters. In any period of economic difficulty, construction was one of the first things to cease.

General shopkeepers feature significantly in the ranks of the FLS. In line with the low level of skill and capital that Crossick and Haupt indicate was required to enter this occupation, general shopkeeping appears to have been carried on in Christchurch by the poorly capitalized, under-skilled, and/or newly arrived. It seems, therefore, to have been something of a transitional occupation that few persisted with by choice. A number of shopkeepers were qualified tradesmen. At least five FLS members set up as general shopkeepers; two of whom - Augustus Thiele and John Thompson - were bakers by trade. Thiele, a German who opened a store in Cashel St in 1863, was bankrupt in 1867, 1879 and 1882. After arrival in 1859, Thompson worked for miller, Daniel Inwood, as a miller and storekeeper before becoming a post office clerk and an assistant at the Canterbury Musical Depot. In 1867 he was bankrupt, and a benefit was held for him the following year.[15] Henry Bowker was a Market Square grocer. Thomas Mutton mitigated the instability of general shopkeeping by running a building business in conjunction with his Lyttelton grocer's. Similarly, William Cuddon sold groceries in conjunction with his drapery and

[15] I assume on the basis of probability that the 'Thompson' of the FLS was John M. Thompson. This may be incorrect. The 'Depot' was probably a shop.

brewing interests. Richard Parish (WMA) operated as a general dealer in Christchurch in the 1860s.

Makers of small iron goods are identified by Crossick and Haupt as amongst those whose trade was unstable because of a sensitivity to fluctuating consumer demand. They identify ironmongers, however, as part of the petty bourgeois elite because of their skill and capital. This seems contradictory, for logic would suggest a certain co-relation between economic stability and social status. Perhaps there was economic discontinuity between the producers of certain articles in the British iron trade. In colonial Christchurch, though, the non-specific nature of iron goods production and retailing makes it difficult to make such a differentiation. William Barnes (WMA), for example, is plainly of the elite. Barnes advertised himself as an iron and brass founder, millwright, engineer, and smith. He began the 'Railway Foundry' in 1863, and by 1869 had a substantial business employing nineteen people. This would have been one of the largest enterprizes in Christchurch in the period. Barnes, however, also exhibits the instability of the small iron goods manufacturer. In late 1869, he faced bankruptcy proceedings, although he was not judged insolvent. In 1872, Barnes sold the foundry to Scott Bros., and moved to Temuka.[16] One of the two mechanically-minded Hadley brothers was a member of the WMA. John Hadley was an ironmonger, and Josiah Hadley, an engineer and well-sinker who reputedly sank the first well in Christchurch. In 1867 Josiah opened a Durham St shop offering to do work on pumps, artesian wells, and gas and steam work. He may have been bankrupt in 1871. Also competing for the title of first man to sink an artesian well in Christchurch was qualified mining engineer, John Jebson, a member of the FLS. Jebson also supervized the erection of the province's first telegraph lines. In the mid 1860s he resumed his original career when he moved to Sheffield and became manager of the Kowhai Coal Mining Company. J. Parry, E. V. Hiorns and William Austin (all FLS) were plumbers; and Hiorns and Austin were also tinsmiths. Austin, who settled in Lyttelton, had been a marine engineer. His shop was

---

[16] *MacDonald. DNZB* vol. 1, p 16 reports 1862 as the date of foundation.

destroyed in the Great Fire of 1870. H. W. Childs (FLS) was also a Lyttelton tradesman, a blacksmith who worked for his father, the first smith in the port town.[17]

Another group that Crossick and Haupt identify as susceptible to the vagaries of consumer demand were tailors and shoemakers. The two possible bootmakers have been identified in the sample (though the identity of neither is positive).[18] J. Goodman (FLS) was probably a relation of bootmaker Samuel Goodman who arrived in 1858, and opened a shop in Colombo St. In 1866 Samuel went into partnership to form the firm of Harris and Goodman.[19] One of the Yorkshire-born Caygill brothers, John or James, was also a member of the FLS. John was a Market Square bootmaker, and James, a compositor, was director and manager of the *Evening Mail* John was bankrupt in 1869.[20] The two tailors in the sample were Henry Flavell (FLS)[21] and John Morgan, WMA secretary in 1865.

The construction or building trades were particularly unstable because they were subject both to a low level of training and capital, and sensitive to changes in demand. Evidence suggests that the employment circumstances of carpenters and builders in New Zealand were no exception. Roth notes that, late in the century, unemployment was higher amongst carpenters than amongst wage and salary earners generally. In 1879, the building sector union reported that carpenters were suffering the worst from the depression at that time because they were being undercut by unqualified 'weatherboard hands' who would work for less than adequate wages. In Wellington, in 1880, one third of carpenters were unemployed.[22] In Christchurch, in 1866, 'A Builder' wrote to the *Lyttelton Times* to

---

[17] In Christchurch in 1864, there were two foundries, five ironmongers, six tinsmiths, two zinc workers, and seven blacksmiths. *Doyle Bros and Jackson's Christchurch Directory* (1864) cited in J. P. Morrison *The Evolution of a City* Christchurch; Christchurch City Council, 1948. p 91

[18] There were twenty-one boot and shoe makers in Christchurch in 1864. ibid.

[19] J. Goodman and Samuel Goodman had adjoining sections in Colombo St in 1867. *Electoral Roll of the Province of Canterbury* 1868. J. Goodman was probably therefore a relation of Samuel's, and may have worked for him. However, he may also have been one James Goodman, head clerk to R. D Thomas, Barrister and Solicitor. This James was also a specialist calligrapher, creating illuminated addresses etc.

[20] The *Evening Mail* seems to have had a nonconformist Northern influence. My Great Great Grandfather Thomas Asquith, a compositor by trade and an employee, director, and investor in the paper, was also a Yorkshireman.

[21] The initial given in the *Lyttelton Times* was 'J', however they are probably one and the same person.

[22] H. Roth 'Unemployment among New Zealand Carpenters 1876-1900', *Australian Economic History Review* vol. 18 no. 1, 1978. pp 72-3

reprimand it for its opinion that good carpenters would readily find work. 'We now have more carpenters in the place than can now find employment', he said; 'some of them as good mechanics as we are likely to import from home for a long time to come.' He added that the number of unemployed was likely to increase over the coming months.[23] Despite this instability, however, Olssen considers that carpenters had a high level of control over their work, and that that they were both geographically and socially mobile.[24] These two, almost contradictory tendencies, would perhaps give carpenters an empathy towards the difficulties of the unemployed born of experience, whilst having the independence of thought and action to act on their political convictions.

The construction trades are well represented in the ranks of the Working Man's Association and Freehold Land Society, and amongst the ranks of the unemployed in Christchurch during the late 1860s.[25] The Working Men's Association had three members in the building or wood-working trades: a builder, a cabinet-maker, and one who may have been either; two - and possibly three - painters, and two plasterers. This equates to seven of the eighteen identified occupations. The Canterbury Freehold Land Society had eight members in the building/wood-working trades: five builders, two cabinet-makers and one who may have been either; two painters, a sawyer, and a stone mason. This equates to twelve of the thirty-three identified occupations.[26]

Those of the sample in the building and wood-working trades were George Cresswell, Robert England, Thomas Mutton, J. Nelson, J. Wilcox[27], John Hopper, and

---

[23] *Lyttelton Times* 17 July 1866

[24] Olssen pp 111-112

[25] A number of men who were not members of the sample organizations, but who were in the construction industry, participated in the unemployed agitations of 1864, 1867, and 1868. James Flint (1864) and Thos. Garlick (1867) were builders, Thos. Dalton (1867) and Thos. Cooper (1867, 1868) were bricklayers, and William Mellor (1867), a contractor.

[26] Doyle Bros. and Jackson's *Christchurch Directory* of 1864 featured thirty six builders and nine carpenters. It has been suggested to me that the term builder equated with "master" or employer, and carpenter with "journeyman" or employee. There is no real evidence for this, however, and contemporary sources seem to use the terms interchangably - as does Olssen in *Building the New World*. In this particualar directory, the term carpenter may be synonomous with cabinet-maker. Cited in Morrison p 91.

[27] Wilcox may have been either J. P. or J. S., who were, respectively, a Christchurch carpenter and a Lyttelton cabinet maker.

William Howley[28] of the FLS; Elijah Gadd and Thomas Kent[29] of both the WMA and FLS; and (possibly) one of the three Samuel's brothers (WMA).[30] George Cresswell was a builder who arrived on the Sir George Seymour in 1850. His commissions during the fifties and sixties included the original Clarendon Hotel, and the Papanui houses of leading non-conformist citizens Turner, Garrick (also a FLS member), and Peacock.[31] Robert England, partner in the Lyttelton firm England Brothers (est. 1860), was a successful builder and contractor. He moved his operation to Christchurch in 1870. Thomas Mutton was also a Lyttelton builder and contractor, who had arrived by 1853. He had a reputation for building homes on easy terms. Elijah Gadd was the builder who constructed the first Christchurch town hall in 1857. Thomas Kent, John Hopper, and William Howley were cabinet-makers.

Other 'construction' trades represented in the WMA and FLS were those of painter, plasterer, stonemason, and sawyer. The mason was Issac Butterfield (FLS), a well-known Christchurch tradesman; and the sawyer, Thomas Stapleton (FLS), who, in 1865, was running the Victoria Sawmill in Tuam St. The painters were William Samuels, James Gapes (both WMA), John St Quentin (WMA, FLS) and John Elliott (FLS). WMA founder, and FLS secretary St Quentin was a prominent, if not the leading painter-decorator in Christchurch at this time. Unlike many of the tradesmen represented in these pages, an identifiable example of his work is still extant. This is the magnificent stencilled ceiling of the stone debating chamber of the provincial council, which he executed in 1865.[32] William Samuels, like St Quentin was a painter-decorator. He went bankrupt in 1866. After a stint as

---

[28] There is no one of the name Howley in any of the sources. However a William Howell features in the *MacDonald Dictionary,* and the names are sufficiently similar that they are probably the same individual.
[29] In the *Lyttelton Times* Kent's Christian name is Thomas, but in the *MacDonald Dictionary* the same individual is William. They are indisputably the same individual.
[30] Three Samuels' resided in Christchurch in the 1860s, of whom one belonged to the WMA . These three men were probably related, as all were members of the fire police. Charles and Edward were respectively cabinet maker and contractor; though the most likely candidate for membership was probably painter/decorator William, who was closely involved with community activities.
[31] The George Cresswell of the *Lyttelton Times* is probably (but not definitely) the Thomas Cresswell of the *MacDonald Dictionary.* The misidentification of individuals in the newspaper seems a common fault.
[32] This was probably designed by the architect of the buildings, Benjamin Mountfort. St Quentin's stern likeness is carved into a corbel in the chamber. Other design work completed at this time included the chancel of St. Johns, Latimer Square (c. 1865), transparencies for the visit of the Governor, Sir George Grey, and a seal for the borough council.

the licensee of the White Horse Inn in Tuam St, he turned to retailing, and ran a paint shop in Papanui. James Gapes was also a painter and Papanui retailer of paint and glass. John Elliott was a Kaiapoi painter. A Mrs Elliott, possibly John's wife, was also a member of the FLS - one of a small number of female members. The plasterers were Samuel Andrews and Charles Worth (both WMA). Samuel Andrews arrived in Auckland from Australia in 1864 to fulfil a contract with the Union Bank of Australia. He subsequently moved to Nelson and Dunedin on further plastering jobs with the bank, before settling in Christchurch, where he embarked on a long political career.[33]

Crossick and Haupt note that drapers were among the stable elite of the petty bourgeoisie in Europe. At least four drapers were represented in the sample, three of whom were prominent men in Christchurch. William Pratt (FLS) arrived at Nelson in 1843 and Wellington in 1848 before coming to Lyttelton in 1849, where he began a drapery. He disposed of the business in 1854, and farmed in Nelson until 1863, when he returned to Christchurch and re-established the business. The drapery prospered and Pratt expanded his city shop in 1869, and opened a branch in Lyttelton - eventually employing twelve men. Charles Bowker, the brother of fellow FLS member H. L. Bowker, was his head man. In 1872 Pratt retired, and sold his Cashel St. premises to the Ballantynes. The second prominent draper was George Beath (FLS). Beath arrived in Christchurch in 1866, and joined with Oscar Kirby to found a drapery in the old Christchurch Town Hall in High St. After Kirby's death in 1868, he went into partnership with his brother-in-law to form the notable Christchurch firm. The third notable draper was William Cuddon (FLS). Arriving with £3,000 in 1856, Cuddon imported the first engine into Canterbury to operate his sawmill in Le Bons Bay. In 1860 he opened a drapery in Tuam St, which he extended into groceries in 1869. In that year he also began brewing. A fourth draper in the FLS may have been one of the Roach family. Frederick was a hatter and draper who went bankrupt in

---

[33] According to *MacDonald*, Andrews settled in Christchurch in 1865. The *DNZB* vol II, (C. Orange ed.) Wellington: Bridget Williams Books/Dept. of Internal Affairs, 1993. p 7. says this occured 'soon after 1864'. However, Andrews and Worth initiated a plasterers' society in the city in 1864. (see below)

1871. Frederick's nephew George was a High St. tobacconist whose shop, ironically, was destroyed by fire in 1866. He resumed trading in 1868 in Dunedin. Richard Parish of the WMA operated as a general dealer in Christchurch in the 1860s, but in 1872-73, he moved to Oxford where he set up as a draper and importer.[34]

Four bakers feature in the FLS, though only two worked at their trade in Christchurch. Alexander Christie first arrived at Lyttelton in 1863 destined for the goldfields. After returning to Scotland to collect his family, he set up as a baker and confectioner in Christchurch in 1868.[35] Christian Ditfort, a German baker who had been residing in London, set up shop in Christchurch in 1864.

Publicans and brewers are a significant occupational group in the FLS. As chapter five will show, this is curious considering the temperance influence in the WMA. Only two identifiable members of the WMA were publicans. These were former painter William Samuels, who became proprietor of the White Horse Inn for a period after his bankruptcy in 1866, and William Parish, of the 'George and Dragon'. The difference in numbers involved in the drink trade suggests something of a social disjunction between the two organisations.[36] Nevertheless, Olssen notes that hotel keepers, with master tradesmen, were the leading labour activists of the 1880s.[37] William Savage of the FLS, was the proprietor of the Selwyn Accommodation House in 1865, and Slades Hotel in Christchurch in 1866. In 1872 he opened the Scotch Stores, a wholesale and retail wine and spirit outlet. Of four Barrett brothers, one - probably John, who ran Barrett's Hotel - belonged to the FLS.[38] The plumber E. V. Hiorns took over the Central Hotel in 1872. J. W. Morten was a famous chef, who arrived in Christchurch from Melbourne in 1864. He took over the Oriental Hotel,

---

[34] T. Taylor, a draper, was involved in the Kaiapoi unemployment agitation in 1867.
[35] In 1886, Christie's biscuit factory was purchased by Bruce Aulsebrook, probably of Aulsebrooks biscuits fame.
[36] Morrison notes that Christchurch had a large number of hotels and breweries from its earliest years. In 1864 there were six brewers and one cordial and wine manufacturer servicing twenty-eight hotels in the city and suburbs. Morrison, p. 91.
[37] Olssen, p 168.
[38] The member may also have been Charles, who replaced John on the municipal council when John died in 1866.

then Birdsey's, which he renamed the Commercial. In 1869 he opened Morten's Marine Hotel at Sumner. He was bankrupt in 1866. W. Lawrence was leaseholder of the Papanui Hotel.[39] William Vincent entered into partnership in the City Brewery in 1861, a business he continued until 1889. William Cuddon began brewing in 1869. R Manning also had a brewery in Barbadoes St.[40]

A diverse range of petty bourgeois trade and retail, and some service occupations, were represented in the two organisations by only one member. Aaron Ayers (FLS) was a Colombo St hairdresser and 'character' of fastidious personal habits.[41] J. Carder (FLS) who arrived in 1863 was a Lyttelton customs agent. He was bankrupt in 1876. Henry Dunsford (FLS) was a sea captain and former manager of the Ballarat Bank of New South Wales, who arrived in Lyttelton in 1858, and set up as a sailmaker and chandler in Norwich Quay. He became a prominent merchant in the port, but was bankrupt in 1868. J. T. Wilkin was one of the few members of the FLS who was not primarily either a tradesman or retailer. Arriving in 1851, he practised both as an accountant and chemist's assistant in Lyttelton, before joining the Post Office. In 1865 he became postmaster at the port. Another Lyttelton public servant was Charles Hodge (FLS), a landing waiter for Her Majesty's Customs. Samuel Ashbolt (FLS) was a groom and jockey who arrived in Christchurch in 1858 to work for Edward Jerningham Wakefield, whom he had known in Wellington. In 1862 he sued the perennially dissolute Wakefield for outstanding wages. One of the most prominent citizens in the FLS was its treasurer, the Scottish nurseryman William 'Cabbage' Wilson. Wilson arrived in Christchurch in 1851, and until 1873 was the leading nurseryman in the city. He was a substantial property investor, and his land holdings were considerable. His other business interests included: a house and land agency, in which he was in partnership with H.

---

[39] *CPER* 1868 and 1872.

[40] R. Manning of the FLS is probably one and the same as W. Manning, brewer of Barbadoes St. *Wises Commercial Directory,* 1872. This connection is made through the *CPER* of 1868 and 1872, where R. Manning is the only person of that surname in the street. Another possible FLS licence holder was T. Davis, who may have been Roland Davis, a publican and former London radical (see chapter 5). Michael Hart, who was involved with the 1867 unemployment agitation, was proprietor of the White Hart Hotel from 1851. Fellow agitator Hugh Bennetts was running the Star Temperance Hotel in 1862-3 and again in 1870.

[41] Ayers was in partnership with a Mr Hooper, who may have been the FLS member "Hopper".

E. Alport; a general trading company; a controlling interest in the Halswell quarry;[42] a half share in a trading vessel; and a directorship in the Grey River Coal Company.[43] The Milsom family, soda water manufacturers, are an interesting case, as no less than five members belonged to the FLS. Brothers George, Henry, and Joseph Milsom carried on the family business in Kaiapoi; St Asaph Street, Christchurch; and Lyttelton respectively. The Milsoms were also unusual in that two of Joseph's daughters, Mary Sophia, and Catherine were apparently full members of the society.[44] R. Robinson (FLS) was a chemist and J. Pearson (FLS) a gardener.

One common characteristic of European petty bourgeois enterprize, distinguished by Crossick and Haupt, was movement to and fro between different trades and different forms of retail, and between trade and retail. In the European situation, this was largely a product of economic instability. In the colonial situation, it may also be seen to be a pragmatic response to available opportunities. There are many examples of this characteristic in the sample. William Wilson is perhaps the most prominent. Builder, Elijah Gadd opened a quarry at Heathcote in 1863, and had a commercial garden. Plasterer, Samuel Andrews also operated a quarry, and worked as an auctioneer, land agent, and general contractor. Baker, J. M. Thompson worked succesively as a miller, a storekeeper, a post office clerk, and as an assistant at the Canterbury Musical Depot.[45] Land and estate agent, Henry Bowker was running a grocer's in Colombo St by 1872.[46] Sometimes the marginality of small enterprize encouraged some members of the petty bourgeoisie to operate more than one business simultaneously - often a retail outlet in conjunction with a trade. In addition to the possibly concurrent operation of some of the enterprizes just mentioned, there are some definite examples in the sample. At the time Charles Worth (WMA) was endeavouring to set up a plasterers society in 1864, he was also proprietor of the Hope Coffee Shop and Boarding

---

[42] This may have been in conjunction with that of Samuel Andrews.
[43] *DNZB* vol. I, p 603. See chapter 4 for comment on his landholdings.
[44] Other female members of the FLS included Mrs Elliott, probably the wife of member John Elliott; Mrs Cotton, whose husband was also a member; Mrs A. and Miss M. M. Graham; and Miss P. Smith.
[45] I assume that the 'Depot' was a shop.
[46] *Wises*

House in Market Square. Thomas Mutton (FLS) ran a Lyttelton grocer's in conjunction with his building business, and nurseryman William Wilson (FLS) had extensive business interests, as we have seen. Instability could also force the petty bourgeoisie from their nominally independent positions into waged labour which, in purely financial terms, was not always a backwards step. John Morgan (WMA), a tailor who was bankrupt in 1867, was running the tailoring department of a larger firm by 1873.

Trade Unions

Many members of the Working Man's Association were skilled tradesmen. The association, however, was an umbrella body that integrated a variety of tradesmen and retailers. There would, therefore, seem to be a place for the organization of trade unions to concentrate on the circumstances peculiar to specific trades - especially in the light of the employment difficulties of the period (see below). One particular Christchurch trade collective whose foundation was broadly contemporary with that of the WMA was the plasterers union. In November 1864, a meeting of plasterers was called at the Colombo St residence of Charles Worth for the purpose of forming a union. Samuel Andrews was elected interim secretary.[47] Both men would subsequently become members of the Working Man's Association. There is, however, no evidence that this union persisted for any length of time. Indeed more generally, there is little evidence of the sustained existence of trade unions in Christchurch during the late 1860s. Why was this so?

The growth and composition of trade unions in New Zealand is held to have generally reflected contemporary British models. There is serious problem with this interpretation, however. Roth writes that unions were most prominent in New Zealand 'when hard times or industrial trouble threatened'.[48] Yet it is accepted that in nineteenth-century Britain, trade unions flourished only when trade was good and labour was in demand. British trade unions spread during the comparatively prosperous years from the

---

[47] *Lyttelton Times* 1 November 1864

[48] H. Roth 'The Historical Framework' *Industrial Relations in New Zealand* Wellington; Methuen, 1978. p 23. cited in J. Deeks, J. Parker, R. Ryan, *Labour and Employment Relations in New Zealand* Auckland; Longman Paul, 1994. p 36.

1850s to the 1870s.[49] How does one account for this fundamental inconsistency between New Zealand and the old country? Has Roth made a mistake? An answer both to this discrepancy, and the apparent absence of developing unions in Christchurch at this time, might be found in the relation between unions and mid-Victorian liberalism.

Despite the continued growth of unions in Britain during the 1860s, unions of this period were still limited to skilled workers. The majority of workers were non-unionised, although this began to change in the early 1870s when unionization reached a 'high tide'. The spread of unionization amongst trades was also variable. The Amalgamated Society of Carpenters was one of the most significant. Hopkins notes a marked hostility between the skilled and unskilled in Britain that continued into the 1870s. The identification of unions and skill helped to perpetuate this division. During the 1860s, a social change that paralleled that taking place in society at large revolutionized the organization and attitudes of unions. The largest unions came to accept the prevailing liberal economic paradigm. Therefore the period was marked by the rise of a conciliatory attitude, and an increasing emphasis on negotiation and respectability. In tandem with this, employers began to accept the right of unions to exist. The late 1860s were also characterized by a move by trade unions into direct political action.[50]

The growth of trade unions in New Zealand broadly paralleled these British trends. The early unions were craft-based, and indeed were often established as branches of British unions. Deeks describes the local unions of this period as 'conservative' rather than 'militant'. This conservatism is probably better described as mid-Victorian liberalism, however, for in common with their British counterparts, the New Zealand unions functioned as friendly societies, and were concerned with legality and political representation. Where New Zealand unions differed from their British compatriots, however, was that they were struggling and weak over the entire period 1860 to 1880.[51] This cannot be attributed to

---

[49] E. Hopkins *Working Class Self Help in Nineteenth Century England* New York; St Martins, 1995. pp 95, 121.
[50] ibid pp 121-138 The first British 'working class' MPs were elected in 1874. p 133
[51] Deeks et. al. pp 36-37

prosperity, for in Britain this assisted the growth of unionism. One answer may have been the small scale of much New Zealand enterprize, where the close relation of employees and employers ensured a community of interest.[52] Therefore there would have been little reason to form unions. This factor, though, may not have differentiated them greatly from the unionized Britsh tradesman. A second factor in the formation of unions was a sufficient concentration of tradesmen in the towns, and (related to this) a strong sense of craft identity and purpose.[53] Colonial towns may not have reached this critical mass. A third factor may have been the unstable and irregular state of the local market for most artisanal trades - although by Roth's reckoning this should have encouraged union formation.[54]

Yet another explanation may have been the ultra-liberalism of New Zealand's petty bourgeois settlers. The goal of the mid-Victorian liberal petty bourgeoisie was a 'competancy', or 'independence'. Ideally this was an individual formulation. But in the face of the monopoly, vested interest, and privilege believed by the petty bourgeoisie to be implicit in the operation of British society, the accomplishment of an 'independence' paradoxically required a concerted, collective effort. Prosperity made this ideal a more realistic and achievable economic possibility, and encouraged unions as an active vehicle for its achievement. By contrast, economic depression shortened horizons, and dreams were put on hold in the struggle for survival. Unions were therefore weaker at such times. In New Zealand, the goal of an independence - on the land, or through self-employment - was realizable under normal circumstances without collective action. There were believed to be a minimum of systemic impediments to 'getting ahead', so the value of individual achievement was absolute - unadulterated by unnecessary collectivity. Unions were rendered largely redundant. Although an independence was more difficult to achieve in times of hardship, the omnipresence of this social ideal in New Zealand meant that tradesmen turned to the idea of

---

[52] Olssen considers that men of the building trades established their customary work practises in New Zealand without difficulty because their masters shared the craft view on what was fair and just. p 101.
[53] ibid p 254. Olsen also considers that unionism among the skilled was confined to those trades where mechanization threatened. This, however, was simply not a factor in 1860s Christchurch.
[54] Roth cited in Deeks et. al. p 36.

unions as a vehicle / when, in similar circumstances in Britain, they would have been shelving such aspiration. This interpretation may also be linked to the formation of the WMA and the FLS during the depressed years of the late 1860s in Christchurch.

Economic Depression

As we have seen above, the economic situation of the mid-Victorian petty bourgeoisie was dependent and consequently often precarious. This encouraged an orientation towards liberal economic principles, because these emphasized the freedom of the individual from undue economic restriction or compulsion. The political expression of this ideology saw the state as neutral regulator, providing the optimal liberal environment for the functioning of independent small business - through means such as the abolition of monopoly and vested interest, and (particularly important in the colonial world) the fostering of physical infrastructure. In an ideal liberal environment, this interventionist state would eventually cease to exist, having completed its primary function of removing all constraints on the market. In such a world, success and failure were seen to be entirely contingent on personal effort. In the real world, however, where identifiable examples of economic illiberalism inevitably remained, the state was deemed to have failed in its task of removing impediments to enterprize, and was regarded, therefore, as at least partly responsible for business failure. Thus, popular opinion held that government was under an obligation to alleviate social distress resulting from economic factors.[55]

The important caveat in any discussion of the urban petty bourgeoisie in mid-nineteenth century Christchurch is the degree to which their welfare depended on that of the rural hinterland. The city was closely integrated with the rural economy as a service centre, export port, primary processor, and market. Indeed farming was still being carried on within the city boundaries at this time.[56]

---

[55] See chapter 3 for an extended discussion of the role of the state.
[56] Morrison, pp 22, 84-7

During the 1860s rural Canterbury began to undergo a productive transition, from extensive farming to a more capital and labour intensive form of agricultural farming.[57] Consequently the province underwent a remarkable growth in agricultural productivity from about 1868, which saw it quickly become the pre-eminent agricultural region.[58] In tandem with this transition, secondary industry began to establish itself in Christchurch, although it did not fully blossom until the following decade.[59] The petty bourgeoisie, however, probably did not benefit as fully from the transition as inference might suggest, for Canterbury evinced something of a dual economic character at this time. In spite of burgeoning agricultural productivity, the late 1860s were for many small, newly established farmers a time of unparalleled difficulty. The small farmer suffered through a combination of international economic depression - which led to falling prices for exportable commodities, over-production for the local market, and particularly, the persistent desire for an independence on the land - without this being an economic proposition. Such prosperity as there was, therefore, was confined to the larger and more established farming units.[60] This pattern was to have a detrimental effect on the small proprietors of Christchurch.

From 1864 New Zealand began to slip into a recession that was to last until 1871. One of the first indicators of the onset of straightened circumstances in Canterbury were the consecutive requests from the provincial government to the roads boards in October and December 1864, that the boards limit their calls on the provincial treasury; and then that they postpone all applications for funding.[61] In 1867-68, the stagnation of English commerce saw the depression make its effects more widely felt, and brought about a widespread economic downturn in Canterbury. The prices of grain, wool, and stock fell substantially, and small farming became all but uneconomic in the province.[62] In early 1868, it was estimated that

---

[57] A. Pticaithly 'A History of Canterbury, New Zealand 1861-67' M. A. thesis, Canterbury College, 1938. p 194
[58] P. Norris 'A Social Portrait of Canterbury in 1870' M. A. thesis: University of Canterbury, 1964. pp 11-12
[59] Morrison p 89-91
[60] Scotter, 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. pp 212-3
[61] ibid p 134
[62] ibid, pp 167, 212

half the mercantile community was bankrupt, and half of all farmers ruined or seriously crippled.[63] Land sales slipped from £280, 000 in the year to June 1864, to only £39, 000 in 1868, with a corresponding catastrophic loss of provincial revenue.[64]

The impact of the depression was aggravated by the provincial government's obstinate adherence to the concept of the 'sufficient price' as the ideal mode of distributing land. The high sufficient price was in part ostensibly a means of ensuring that a farmer was adequately capitalized and had gained appropriate skills before he was able to take up land. The credo of independence was so strongly indoctrinated, however, that many aspiring farmers took up land before they had the necessary capital or experience to farm successfully. In the absence of an official system of deferred payment, the acquisition of land in this manner often necessitated the employment of land agents such as Harman and Stevens, who would sell on terms. This encouraged the development of agriculture, but also made small farming more speculative and precarious, as the success of these new ventures was very dependent on a buoyant economy. According to Scotter, hundreds of under-prepared and under-capitalized farmers lost everything in 1868, a year in which grain performed poorly.[65] This instability, which manifested itself in the late 1860s, gave rise to something I have called the problem of the 'rural conundrum'.

The struggle between farmers and squatters for control of land is well documented.[66] Less well known is the 'rural conundrum' of the struggle between the small farmer and the rural labourer for economic survival.[67] The sufficient price was theoretically set at a level that would provide ample labour for arable farming provided that moderate immigration was maintained. However the premature occupation of land, as a consequence of high wages and impatience for an independence, subverted the principle.[68] This deprived

---

[63] *Canterbury Times* 11 April 1868, cited in Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. p 167.
[64] appendix 2, fig. 7. Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. pp 114, 167
[65] ibid p 207, 212
[66] See for example ibid pp 178-216
[67] J. Martin *The Forgotten Worker: The Rural Wage Earner in Nineteenth Century New Zealand* Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Trade Union History Project, 1990. p 18
[68] This was not always the case, however, as small farmers would also provide labour to augment the income

existing farmers of the necessary quantity of labour, whilst pushing up the price of the labour that remained to unaffordable levels. Ironically, it also put the employment of labour beyond the means of the indebted new farmer. The agriculturist was therefore under considerable economic pressure to reduce the price of labour. He also argued that a reduction in the price of labour would permit the employment of greater numbers. High wages, however, were in the interests of the landless labourer, who naturally saw in them an opportunity for the achievement of an early independence himself. The labourer therefore campaigned for the maintenance of the rate of wages.[69] Thus, a rift developed between the small farmer and the aspiring small farmer. During the worst years of the depression - 1867-8 - something of a stalemate was reached between farmers unable to afford labour, and labourers who were therefore unable to afford land. Social mobility was restricted, and both sides suffered as a result.[70]

Much of this sometimes heated debate between farmers and labourers centred on an immigration/labour nexus. The only sure way the farmer had of capping the demands of wage labour was to introduce more labour into the province. The labour market would therefore become more competitive, driving the wage rate down. The catch cry of the small farmer during the difficult times of the late 1860s was 'increase immigration'. Naturally, labourers generally opposed further immigration.[71] In the event, immigration to Canterbury fell sharply during the late 1860s, as the provincial government observed its towns filling with unemployed (and unemployable) labour.[72] Only 719 immigrants were introduced to Canterbury between 1868 and 1870.[73]

The economic depression of the late 1860s, and the generally negative effect it had on the rural community, had extensive repercussions for Christchurch's petty bourgeoisie.

---

from their own land. ibid p 3

[69] See for example *Lyttelton Times* 20 July 1867, where the provincial council select committee on unemployment concluded that labourers were out of work because they refused to accept lower wages.

[70] R. Silcock 'Immigration into Canterbury under the Provincial Government' M. A. thesis: University of Canterbury, 1963. pp 53-55

[71] ibid p 54

[72] Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. pp 218, 221

[73] ibid p 313

Firstly, the 'over-trading' of the early and mid-1860s built an artificial prosperity that collapsed.[74] Secondly, as the rural economy contracted, farmers tightened their belts, labourers became unemployed, and the market for urban goods and services contracted.[75] Thirdly, the universal association of land and independence meant that the ideal of rural land ownership was strongly ingrained even in the urban petty bourgeois psyche. Because of the depression, however, this desire was increasingly difficult to satisfy.[76] The fourth factor was the result of the rural conundrum. The accumulating population of labourers unable to get rural labouring work at an acceptable rate, and unable therefore to gain their 'independence' on the land, probably swelled the urban labour pool, creating competition in the job market.[77] This would have especially been the case in those trade and retail opportunities that required less skill and capital.

The economic experience of many of the Christchurch's 'permanent' petty bourgeoisie over the late 1860s would therefore also have been one of financial difficulty, and un- or under- employment. This may account for the bankruptcies amongst the petty bourgeois membership of the FLS and WMA; and for the financial difficulties of the FLS over this period, when it appears there were constant problems with late payment and withdrawals.[78] The economic interests of the tradesman and retailer may thus be seen to be convergent with those of the socio-economically immobile farm labourer. All desired a prosperous, extensive, and independent rural yeomanry - the latter for the independence it represented, and the former for the secure customer base and decreased competition in the urban labour market. Therefore it was in their common interest to act conjointly to oppose

---

[74] Morrison, p 87. This involved excessive importation, and the subsequent sale of goods at unsustainable prices.
[75] See *Lyttelton Times* 1 December 1864. This letter comments on the difficulties of tradesmen who were dependent on labourers.
[76] See chapter 4, on land. This demonstrates that an attraction to land did not necessarily lead to a desire to farm.
[77] J. Martin, 'Unemployment, Government, and the Labour Market in New Zealand, 1860-90 *New Zealand Journal of History* vol. 29 no. 2 (1995). p 176
[78] See chapter 4.

the further introduction of labour into the province, and in demonstrations against unemployment.

Unemployment

John Martin contends that the nature of unemployment in Victorian New Zealand has been misunderstood. This is because modern experience associates it with actual job loss during depression conditions. This, he continues, is a misnomer because the so-called 'unemployment' of the 1860s was rather the structural and omnipresent phenomenon of under-employment. Under-employment was the common experience of a considerable portion of the colonial workforce, both in good and bad times. Only when this widespread absence of work lengthened into months, and affected a larger proportion of the population than was usual, was the title unemployment accorded to it.

Under-employment was pervasive because of the character of the labour market which mirrored the nature of the colonial economy. The New Zealand economy was susceptible to external fluctuations in the prices of wool and wheat, and vulnerable to the impacts of immigration and public works policy. The labour market was therefore highly unstable, casual, seasonal, and could thus become quickly glutted. The under-employment that resulted was particularly evident in rural and extractive enterprize, and associated industry. The regional nature of the economy acts as a caveat to this blanket generalisation, however. Because of differing provincial policies, transport difficulties, and an inter-provincial wage differential that encouraged migration, labour shortages and surpluses could be very localized.

Seasonality in the primary sector of the economy saw demand for labour concentrated into a short period over summer, during which the rural waged workforce would effectively double in some regions. Martin considers that the pool from which these workers were drawn was perhaps well over three times as large as the number of jobs available. The effects of seasonality were also evident in other sectors of the economy, particularly in primary product processing. Manufacturing, which was small scale,

undercapitalized, vulnerable to undercutting, and which concentrated on domestic consumption, also experienced the repercussions of the seasonal hiccups. The construction industry was particularly unstable, always being depressed over winter, and suffering first and worst in any recession.

To mitigate the worst effects of this seasonality, both agriculture and urban industry were characterized by a dual labour market where a core of permanent employees would be supplemented by a large number of less skilled casuals. It was this floating reserve, whose income was often precarious at the best of times, who suffered most from economic downturn. Martin estimates that the labourers and building workers who constituted many of this group usually spent between 10 and 25% of their time out of work, but this could stretch to 6 months or more during a particularly severe episode of economic depression.

Protest against unemployment invariably took place during the winter slack, when the largest number were out of work and were often congregating in urban areas, either in the search of work, and/or having returned home to their families. Martin observes that the unemployed tended to gather in public places in order to pick up relief work, receive charitable aid, and no doubt vented their frustrations to each other on such occasions.[79] Agitation, however, did not manifest itself in spontaneous unruly mobs, but rather in often boisterous public meetings, whose object was to reach a collective resolution, and petition provincial government to act upon it. Trade unions were not a feature of the employment environment until the boom of the 1870s.

Provincial government was the target of these protests for a number of reasons. These were often related to the idea of a social contract. As the provincial governments had, in a number of cases, initiated the immigration of labour,[80] so they were regarded as having an unwritten obligation to provide work or charitable aid for their citizens in times of hardship, and to tailor their immigration policies to maintain the labour market accordingly. Because the power to sell unoccupied crown (or so called 'waste') land also resided with the

[79] I also imagine that sociability played some part in these gatherings!
[80] Particularly Canterbury and Otago.

provincial governments, they also became the target of popular clamour in times of hardship, for that land to be made more accessible through price reductions and easier terms. Martin feels the impact of unemployment agitation on provincial government policy was significant. This, he considers, was because the governments were concerned to preserve social order, honour their unwritten contract with immigrants, and maintain their image abroad.[81] It may also be seen, however, as an implicit part of the new regulatory role that mid-Victorian liberal thought conferred on government.[82]

The mid and late 1860s were characterized by four major episodes of unemployment agitation in Christchurch, three of which featured members of the FLS and the WMA as central participants: in 1864, 1867, and 1868. Three of the four protests focused directly on unemployment, but that of 1868 addressed the issue in the context of a debate on immigration.

The first significant period of employment difficulties to strike New Zealand occurred in the late 1850s. During the usual winter recessions of 1858-59, meetings of the unemployed occurred in both Christchurch and Dunedin.[83] In Christchurch, the local agitation was initiated by iron founder W. H. Barnes, who was later to be the secretary of the WMA. Barnes demanded the temporary cessation of immigration, an employment agency, and more road works. The *Lyttelton Times* ridiculed this 'lounging new chum' and accused him of intending 'to crush the Government and the capitalist'.[84] In 1867 Barnes wrote a letter to the paper describing the circumstances of 1859, and supporting the current agitation.[85]

With the onset of the depression of the mid 1860s, serious unemployment was noted - firstly in Dunedin during 1864, as the first flush of gold fever faded. That the situation was equally difficult in Canterbury is revealed by a letter to the *Lyttelton Times* in

---

[81] Martin, *Unemployment* 1995, pp 170-82.
[82] See for example, the declarations of John St Quentin during the 1867 agitation (below), and also chapter 3.
[83] Martin, *Unemployment* 1995, p 178.
[84] *Lyttelton Times* 7 September 1859 and 21 September 1859, cited in *DNZB* vol. I, p 16.
[85] *Lyttelton Times* 13 August 1867

October of that year. This criticized the immigration vote of the Provincial Government, of some £27,000, as too large for the state of the labour market. The correspondent insisted that, 'if this policy was persisted with, the Council would have to soon legislate for workhouses and other measures to relieve an impoverished populace.[86] This apparent hyperbole seems to have been borne out in the next month when a deputation of twelve 'working men' from North Canterbury, led by future FLS member John Elliott, attended the provincial superintendent about the distress from unemployment that blighted their districts. They requested the commencement of public works as a form of immediate relief. Elliott's leadership suggests a petty bourgeois component in the group. The superintendent, Samuel Bealey, assured the deputation that funds would be released to their local roads boards to facilitate this action.[87] A public meeting, which convened at the Kaikanui Hotel in Kaiapoi a few days later to hear the response of the deputation, was attended by one hundred and eighty 'working men', who 'behaved with the utmost propriety' according to the *Lyttelton Times*. On hearing the superintendent's statement, the meeting determined not to work for less than 7s a day in Kaiapoi or 8s per day in the surrounding district.[88] The chairman of the Kaiapoi Roads Board cautioned the meeting that this was a rash decision, for the Board would, at the express command of the superintendent, pay only 5s per day. If, he continued, the resolution was persisted with then the board would submit the work to open tender, thereby depriving the unemployed of their relief. The gathering seems to have reluctantly accepted this, but passed a resolution that if the roads boards provided insufficient work, then a delegation would approach the superintendent again. The meeting closed with a workman proposing that 'they should petition President Lincoln to take them to fight his battles for them, which would be preferable to remaining here to fight the battle of hunger'. Subsequently, it was reported that 20 men had been set to work by the Kaiapoi Roads Board at a rate of 5s per

---

[86] ibid 'Porthos' 22 October 1864
[87] ibid 15 November 1864
[88] The going rate of wages at this time appears to have been 8 or 9s for a labourer.

day. Alleging this rate to be insufficient, they struck the following day, but some then returned to work - no doubt under dire threat.[89]

Shortly afterwards, another meeting, which was reported to be 'occasionally of a noisy character', was called to hear from a deputation who had approached the Rangiora and Mandeville Roads Board. This board's response was the same as its Kaiapoi equivalent: they would pay 5s a day only. The deputation had complained that the going rate was 8s, and then offered to tender for contracts on the open market. On hearing this, the meeting of the unemployed resolved to wait on the superintendent again, and clear up the issue of the rate of wages. The chairman of the Rangiora and Mandeville Roads Board, Marmaduke Dixon, a wealthy farmer and member of the Provincial Council, insisted that the board was not trying to force the rate of wages down, but because of what he termed the 'unusual distress in the colony', they could not afford to pay more. The meeting then resolved to form a co-operative society to benefit the 'working classes',[90] and were urged by the chairman and several other persons to carefully consider who they would elect to the newly founded local municipal council. The meeting closed with a criticism of the provincial council for voting money to its 'friends' that would be better employed providing work for the unemployed.[91]

On 19 November, it was reported that at a meeting of the Kaiapoi Roads Board, a resolution had been passed to the effect that the discontent among the labourers of Kaiapoi was due to the 'dangerous counsel and insidious advice of their chairman Mr John Elliott'. In response to this challenge to his integrity Mr Elliott called a meeting that evening to defend his reputation. The road board members present refused to withdraw their resolution, and reiterated their criticism despite Elliott's best efforts at justification. On their departure, however, the eighty or so working men remaining thumbed their noses at authority and voted unanimously to exonerate Elliott of all blame.[92]

---

[89] ibid 15 November 1864
[90] In late November a meeting of the new cooperative society was convened. It resolved that one hundred shares be issued at £1 each, but only nine were taken up on this occasion. ibid, 24 November 1864
[91] ibid 17 November 1864
[92] ibid 19 November 1864

Four days earlier, on the fifteenth, a second deputation had approached the provincial council, and had been promised by the provincial secretary, William Rolleston, that a commission of enquiry would be appointed to look into the concerns of the unemployed. This commission, consisting mainly of local roads board members and authorized to provide relief work, met initially on the day following the attack on John Elliott's character, and on two subsequent occasions.[93] On the first day, thirty men applied to explain their distress, and to gain work, but on the last day, only three did so.[94] The commission's report stated that they were satisfied that some degree of distress was evident in the area, that relief was necessary, and that they had provided work for forty-eight applicants.[95] The *Lyttelton Times* pointed out that many of these men were skilled artisans, and could profitably seek employment in Christchurch.[96]

This appears to have been the end of the period of active agitation. With summer coming on, work was probably becoming more plentiful. Correspondence on unemployment in the *Lyttelton Times* continued, however, for a few weeks more. In an editorial, the paper claimed that it knew no reason for the outcry in Kaiapoi, and that some men preferred to be idle than accept what their labour was worth.[97] This prompted a vitriolic response from one of the men involved, who chastised the *Times* for being opposed to the interests of the working man, and for encouraging immigration. 'We are not idiots', he said; 'We know when we are hungry or thirsty, and we know our cause is just, better than you can tell us'.[98] This was followed by a second letter in which he commented on the difficulties of tradesmen who depended on the custom of labourers, and asked (facetiously) how the workmen of Canterbury could complain at the 'generous' relief rate of 5s. On the same day, an employer

---

[93] ibid 22 November 1864
[94] ibid 19 November 1864 and 26 November 1864
[95] ibid 22 November 1864 and 15 December 1864
[96] ibid 24 November 1864
[97] ibid 19 November 1864
[98] ibid 24 November 1864

suggested that a register of the state of the provincial labour market be kept, against which claims of distress could be assessed.[99]

In 1867, a trough in the economy coincided with the traditional winter recession, and agitation by the unemployed again became evident. In contrast with the Kaiapoi agitation of 1864, the 1867 agitation appears to have had a more overtly petty bourgeois character. This was certainly true of its leadership. In mid July a *Lyttelton Times* editorial wondered whether the depression had yet reached its low point.[100] The following day it was reported that a meeting of the unemployed at the town hall in High St had resolved that their distress should be relieved by the promotion of re-emigration to other colonies, and especially the United States. E. J. Wakefield opposed emigration, but proposed that the unemployed petition the superintendent for relief. The superintendent, William Moorhouse, appealed to those at the meeting not to abandon the colony, and promised to alleviate their distress. Former WMA, and FLS member, John St Quentin, demanded that this relief be immediate, and undertook to prepare a petition that would be available at his High St workplace.[101] A few days later St. Quentin and two others, including fellow WMA and FLS member John Cutler, presented this petition to the superintendent, in which three hundred signatories requested that public works of a remunerative character be created. St Quentin undertook to open a register for the unemployed.[102]

In response to the petition, the provincial council had a select committee look into the issue. It reported that, although there was as yet no actual destitution in Christchurch, there were a large number of unemployed, especially in the building trades and amongst general labourers, and that if the unemployment were to continue, destitution would soon result. The select committee found that many skilled men were out of work simply because

---

[99] ibid 1 December 1864
[100] ibid 15 July 1867
[101] ibid 16 July 1867
[102] ibid 17 July 1867. In a letter to the paper on 31 July, St Quentin announced that 171 labourers, 65 carpenters, 16 bricklayers, 16 painters, 13 masons, 13 smiths and fitters etc, 5 plasterers, and 20 other trades had signed his register. With respect to his role as an advocate for the 'industrial classes', he declared 'neither sneers, intimidation, or persecution will have the effect of turning me from what I believe to be a public duty'.

there was none. Little evidence was heard from general labourers (which may confirm a petty bourgeois bias to this agitation), but the committee considered that there was no actual shortage of work for such people; the problem with labourers seen as being their insistence on holding out for higher wages than the market could sustain. Several members of the provincial council concurred with this, but opinion was divided, and the council eventually agreed to vote a sum for relief work.[103] Four days later the *Lyttelton Times* reported that fifty-two men had applied to the Immigration Office for the relief work.[104] This number had increased to one hundred and twenty five by the end of the month.[105]

Commenting on the state of unemployment, an editorial in the *Lyttelton Times* suggested that many correspondents were labouring under a misapprehension, for the primary difficulty was amongst 'artisans', not rural labourers.[106] Many of the opinions as to the cause and cure for the unemployment - usually centred on the problems of the 'rural conundrum' - were therefore largely irrelevant. The class of 'artisans', the *Times* continued, were usually more well-off than labourers, often with their own homes and some means, but were prone to temporary distress. These 'artisans' were difficult to assist, for this entailed either generally improving the state of the market, or convincing them to give up their valued self-employed petty bourgeois status and become day labourers. This, said the *Times,* was no disgrace, for distress 'will admit of no nice dallying of occupations and terms'.[107] The following month the paper reiterated its view that the primary victims of the distress were 'trades people and artisans', and suggested that this class would benefit, like labourers, from the acceptance of lower wages.[108]

At the end of July, an unpaid Commission on Unemployment was convened by the government, meeting over three days to further consider the issue.[109] After sifting the

---

[103] ibid 20 July 1867. William Wilson, provincial councillor and probable FLS member, proposed that £2000 be spent.
[104] ibid 24 July 1867
[105] ibid 30 July 1867
[106] See letters from 'SDG' and 'Maintien le Droit' ibid, 23 July 1867
[107] ibid 23 July 1867
[108] ibid 13 August 1867
[109] The commission consisted of J. S. Williams, H. Wynn-Williams, FLS member William Wilson, WMA

evidence provided by various individuals - mainly employers, including a painter and glazier, a carpenter, an unemployed printer, a pastoralist, a large farmer, a minister, the city surveyor, and the immigration officer, they reached a conclusion similar to that of the select committee: that a large number of artisans were out of work simply because there was none; and that many labourers were unemployed because they had agreed amongst themselves not to accept reduced wages. As the select committee had done, they recommended the government provide relief piece-work for subsistence. Evidently the commission had looked into the issue of providing work for 'mechanics' in their 'accustomed trades', but decided that this would be 'exceedingly impolitic, and [could] lead to mischievous consequences'. Relief work, they considered 'should not be of such a kind, nor be paid for at such a rate as would induce men to leave other employment for it, or to remain at it when other employment offered'.[110]

Meeting to consider the findings of the commission, a gathering of unemployed pronounced them unsatisfactory, criticized those who gave evidence as being unrepresentative, and ridiculed the very idea of a co-ordinated wages strike as preposterous. There were also several veiled threats to the physical well-being of the provincial council. St Quentin declared with that it was the duty of the provincial government to provide 'remunerative' employment, on the basis that the 'government ought to stand in the position of a father of a family, and protect every branch of the family equally'. It is perhaps revealing to contrast the ideological positions taken over unemployment by the provincial government, and by St Quentin. The government decided, on the best liberal principles, not to actively intervene because it would disrupt the smooth running of the market. Equally validly in liberal terms, St Quentin felt that society had not yet attained the exalted position of social equity where government could stand back and not intervene. The gathering proposed to appoint its own commission, and candidates were put forward. The eleven names included three members of the previous commission: Andrews, Wilson (the chair of the

---

member Samuel Andrews, Hillyard, and J. Hawkes.

[110] *Lyttelton Times* 30 July 1867, 31 July 1867, 2 August 1867

meeting), and Wynn-Williams; E. J. Wakefield; and WMA and FLS members St Quentin, Cutler, and William Kent.[111] It is unclear, however, whether this commission actually met.

On 9 August, three hundred people gathered in Market Place to debate remedies for the prevalent distress. There was talk of establishing a bank of credit, reducing land prices, and the cessation of immigration.[112] Charles Tribe suggested reviving the by then dormant Working Men's Association to facilitate a co-ordinated action, and this was supported by former member, Cutler.[113] A deputation of Cutler, St Quentin and publican M. B. Hart was delegated to petition the provincial government again. The meeting resumed the following day outside the provincial government building, where it heard from St. Quentin that the provincial solicitor and the provincial secretary had agreed to spend between £800 and £1000 on providing relief work doing such things as clearing the Avon and stone breaking.[114] The officials suggested, however, that they could not see the provincial government commencing works that would provide employment for artisans in their own fields of endeavour, but that the provincial government would make a decision on this.[115] The meeting adjourned again, and reconvened for a third time the next day, when St Quentin reported that the administration would provide further labouring work in the Government Domain and in the Selwyn River, but would not give work to 'mechanics'.[116] Despite the finality of this statement, it was reported at the end of the month that a delegation consisting of one member representing each of the chief trades in the city (a total of five) had attended the deputy superintendent about assistance for skilled workers. The *Lyttelton Times* expressed some confidence that the government would be able to employ a considerable number, but this was misplaced, for the deputation were told that the government were unable to take on any at present.[117]

---

[111] ibid 8 August 1867
[112] ibid 10 August 1867. Market Place is now Victoria Square.
[113] The *Lyttelton Times* originally reported this as a comment from F. C. (Frederic) Tribe. Subsequently, however, F. C. wrote to say that the speaker was C. (Charles) Tribe.
[114] ibid 12 August 1867
[115] ibid 10 August 1867
[116] ibid 13 August 1867. Later that month 145 men were employed in relief work. ibid 22 August 1867
[117] ibid 26 August 1867, 27 August 1867

One of the most prominent agitations against unemployment by the petty bourgeoisie during the late 1860s occurred in 1868, and focused on immigration. Initially, this took the form of a public meeting to discuss a move by the provincial government to vote a sum for immigration.[118] Like the agitation of the previous year, it was an initiative of the petty bourgeoisie rather than of labourers. The *Lyttelton Times* observed that the 'original promoters of the meeting seem to have been representatives of the operative class of the City of Christchurch'. The newspaper went on to say, with a wariness of class typical of liberal thought, that this was a 'class demonstration', and that its opinions, although worthy, should be recognized as partisan. The analysis of the *Times* is confirmed by the active participation of a number of members of the WMA and the FLS. These included John St Quentin, Thomas Kent, and John Cutler (WMA and FLS); and FLS members John Hopper, and William Wilson, who again took the chair. Also involved again were sympathetic members of the middle class, Edward J. Wakefield and Henry Wynn-Williams.

The Christchurch meeting, held at the town hall in High St, discussed a proposed resolution condemning the expenditure of public money on immigration. The sole defender of immigration, a Papanui farmer of German extraction named Philip Tisch, was shouted down. Never shy of making political capital, Wynn-Williams and Wakefield railed against immigration to general acclaim. Wakefield proposed an amendment that no immigration be permitted until further fields of industry be opened up to provide employment. He referred specifically to his cause célèbre, the mineral resources of the Malvern Hills. Wakefield also condemned pastoralists, and importers whose interests he believed were antithetical to the encouragement of local production. John St Quentin seconded the amendment, though Thomas Kent censured Wakefield for getting off the topic. John Cutler demanded that those who wanted labour should pay for its importation. Some immigrants had been condemned as 'sweepings of the street', he said. This was at least partly the fault of those who had brought

---

[118] A private member introduced a motion that £10, 000 be set aside for the introduction of immigrants. This resolution was accepted by the government on condition that the sum be reduced to £7, 500; and that it not be spent unless it were indisputably determined that it was needed. (ibid, 23 April 1868) Early the next month, the *Lyttelton Times* stated that it believed the council was to spend the money. (ibid, 9 May 1868)

them out, for 'if they did not find these men employment, could they wonder that a certain gentleman, who was said to be universally present, should find work for idle hands to do'.[119] The amended resolution was subsequently forwarded to the provincial government by the chairman.[120]

In the weeks following the April meeting, the *Lyttelton Times* published a series of editorials and letters on immigration and the petty bourgeoisie. The *Times* recognized that the employment situation was difficult for 'carpenters, builders, and other mechanics', and that they, therefore, had a grievance. The *Times* was, however, critical of the meeting for a number of reasons. These included its partisan nature, and its capture by the demagogues, Wynn-Williams (who was at that time a member of the provincial executive) and Wakefield, who the paper believed had turned it to their own ends.[121] The newspaper also gave two reasons why it believed it to be wrong for the petty bourgeoisie to oppose immigration. The first point of its critique was predicated on a misapprehension about the urban petty bourgeoisie. The paper pronounced the universal colonial ideal to be landed proprietorship, where the settler became an independent farmer. In theory, this provided an economic impetus to the importation of labour, as settlers moved continually out of the rural proletariat onto their own farms. This assumption did not, however, take into account the disjunction apparent in the experience of the petty bourgeoisie, between the idealization of yeomanry and its practical application. Chapter four shows that many bourgeois were content to remain in their respective urban occupations, and had no need for extra labour that might clog the urban job market. The second argument of the *Lyttelton Times* was predicated on the premise that 'there are too many of those who deal in produce of various kinds instead of producing'. The paper argued that immigration augmented the 'productive' rural population, increasing the export of grain, which thereby generated greater wealth in the community at large. This

---

[119] ibid 23 April 1868
[120] William Wilson subsequently received a note from the government that the resolutions of the meeting would be 'carefully considered'. (ibid, 2 May 1868)
[121] ibid 23 April 1868

wealth, said the *Times* would translate into the 'purchasing [of] goods produced by our own artizans (sic)'. Thus it concluded

> Merchants, tradesmen, and artizans stand very much in their own light when they oppose the introduction of productive labour....It is solely by means of such colonists that provision is made for finding suitable employment for trades, and for what may be termed in general, city operatives.[122]

The newspaper continued this theme of a necessary balance between 'productive' and 'non-productive' sectors of society, in subsequent comments on the April meeting. The truth, it said, is that the province needs labourers, but not artisans 'of any description'.[123]

The anti-immigration stance of the city gathering was, as has been indicated, antithetical to the interests of many of Canterbury's farmers. It precipitated a negative response from this quarter. In a political meeting at the North Canterbury town of Leithfield, for example, William Maskell, a provincial council member for the district, denounced the resolutions of the Christchurch meeting at length.[124] A few days later, an outraged letter from 'Farmer' asked 'What can lodging house keepers, carpenters, and shoemakers be supposed to know about the farmers requirements ?' He suggested that if artisans were troubled by unemployment, they should remove themselves to other places.[125]

In response to the Christchurch meeting, a small gathering of 'the labouring class' was convened at Kaiapoi by the central figure of the 1864 agitation, FLS member John Elliott. Addressing the twenty assembled, Elliott declared that artisans in the colony were no better off than those in England.[126] The meeting was reconvened a week later, when it passed a resolution proposed by Elliott that immigration be suspended for a year. This was to be conveyed to the provincial government by a delegation.[127] The correspondent 'Farmer' suggested sarcastically that the 'thirty five wise men' of the Kaiapoi meeting were 'pulled by strings in the hands of Christchurch's poor men's friends'. 'It must be highly gratifying' he continued

---

[122] ibid 24 April 1868
[123] ibid 4 May 1868
[124] ibid 28 May 1868
[125] ibid 2 May 1868
[126] ibid 11 May 1868
[127] ibid 18 May 1868

> to the latter to see that their example has been followed by an equally influential party in the north, because it is one of the weaknesses of human nature to be very thankful that, if you are foolish, there are others equally so.

'Farmer' concluded, 'The Kaiapoi gentlemen seem to be in the dark altogether or they would never put themselves to such trouble to do the country harm'.[128]

The final episode of unemployment agitation during the depression of the late 1860s occurred during the spring of 1870. A meeting of some 200 convened in Cathedral Square to express displeasure at the General Government's plan to revive immigration when a large number of workmen were unable to find employment. A committee was appointed to co-ordinate action, and communicate their concerns to the authorities. Seven days after the first meeting, the committee reported back to another gathering in the Square that they had rented an office and opened a register which had been signed by 110 men. A deputation proceeded immediately to the provincial government building to ask what was to be done about their circumstances.[129] They reported afterwards that the provincial government had promised to bring no more labour into the province, and that it would endeavour to find work for the petitioners. Two days later, 39 men had applied to the provincial government for relief.[130]

Despite a superficial similarity to those agitations which had gone before, this one was quite different in a number of ways. In the first place, none of the participants were identifiably petty bourgeois. There was no reported involvement by any of the previous agitators, apart from the omnipresent E. J. Wakefield, then the MP for Christchurch East, who took the role of secretary. This curious absence may have come about because of the ideological leanings of the leader of the agitation, James McPherson. These were stated publicly in January 1871, when Macpherson again called a meeting in Cathedral Square. The 600 who attended agreed to form a Working Men's Mutual Protection Society, which would have as its main object the warning of prospective immigrants about New Zealand's depressed labour market. This society differed from that formed in 1865 because it was open

---

[128] ibid 22 May 1868
[129] ibid 12 August 1870
[130] ibid 14 August 1870

only to manual workers. MacPherson identified himself as a farm labourer, not a skilled workman. More importantly, the society corresponded with Karl Marx's International Working Men's Association (the 'First International'), and Macpherson was active in promoting its ideas. The discourse of the society was therefore labourist, class-oriented, and socialist, rather than inclusively liberal. To the former members of the petty bourgeois WMA and FLS, for whom independence was a central value, Macpherson's rhetoric must have seemed dangerously subversive. The new society was comparatively short lived however, possibly rendered redundant by the increasing prosperity of the 1870s. But together, these features suggest that the 1870 unemployment agitation did not correspond in terms of composition, doctrine, and leadership with those of 1859, 1864, 1867, and 1868.[131]

Two central questions remain to be answered with respect to the unemployment agitations. Firstly, why did artisans who were ostensibly employed take such a central role in the majority of these agitations? It may have been simply a recognition of common interest, for the spectre of unemployment hung over the head of even the most prosperous of tradesmen. It may also have been because they were able to do so, with their greater economic independence, education, and (consequently) politization. At perhaps a more significant level, however, these men were consciously adopting a leadership role in the wider working-class community. This was a personal affirmation of the validity (and indeed superiority) of the petty bourgeois socio-economic position, and of the ideology of independence and self improvement which underscored it, and which gave them the confidence to participate in political society. .

A second significant question is raised by Martin's assertion that the unemployment agitations had profound implications for provincial policy.[132] To some extent this is true, for the Canterbury Provincial Council did go to some lengths to deal with the concerns of the

---

[131] H. Roth, J. Hammond, *Toil and Trouble: the Struggle for a Better Life in New Zealand* Auckland: Methuen, 1981. p 18; J. Salmond *New Zealand Labours' Pioneering Days: The History of the Labour Movement in New Zealand from 1840 to 1894* Auckland: Forward Press, 1950, p 22; *DNZB* vol. II, 1993. p 300.

[132] Martin, *Unemployment* 1995, p 175.

unemployed. On the other hand, it is arguable whether there is any direct correlation between the agitations and policy such as the restriction of immigration. Neither did the unemployed always get what they desired in the form of relief work. And lastly, if the agitations had a long-term impact on provincial policy, why was it found necessary to demonstrate repeatedly on the same issues throughout the late 1860s? This would seem to indicate that governmental response were short term only.

Conclusions

The nineteenth-century petty bourgeoisie were economically and occupationally diverse. They were defined, however, by a common characteristic - the employment of both their capital and labour. This gave them a sense of class identity. It also gave them a vaunted, though fragile, economic and social independence. Defence of this independence inclined the petty bourgeois towards liberal economic and social principles.

Analysis of the occupational backgrounds of the membership of the FLS and the WMA shows that although they occupied a broad range and size of enterprize - in both retail and trade, they were uniformly petty bourgeois in type. The depressed economic circumstances of much of rural Canterbury in the late 1860s accentuated the economic instability typical of the urban petty bourgeoisie. It would seem that they did not turn to unions however, perhaps because of the exalted place of individualism in the colonial psyche. What a number of prominent members of both organizations did do was take a leading role in the anti-immigration and unemployment agitations that featured regularly during the period. These aimed to influence the provision of relief work and the cessation of immigration, and were directed at the provincial council because of the mid-Victorian liberal belief in the 'even handed' regulatory role of government in the provision of an optimal economic environment.

CHAPTER 3: POLITICAL LIBERALISM

This chapter examines the liberal political culture to which the petty bourgeois members of the Canterbury Working Man's Association (1865-66), and (to a lesser extent) those of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society (1866-70) belonged. It reviews the context and nature of mid-Victorian liberalism, and the colonial political application of these principles. The chapter then examines the particular form of liberal thought behind the political interests of the petty bourgeois Christchurch Working Men's Association, and considers the manifestation of these values in the debate over candidates for the 1866 provincial election. Finally the importance of municipal politics to members of both the WMA and the FLS are considered.

Political Liberalism

Liberalism was the social doctrine which came to predominate in the mid-Victorian era. The basic tenet of mid-Victorian liberalism was that man entered into society to escape arbitrary control by other men. It was the liberal belief that no man possessed the authority to impress their views on any other. The exercise of human authority was to be distrusted because of the evil inherent in the human condition. The way to develop the ideal, socially and morally well-regulated polity was to allow each individual and religious group the freedom to develop their potential. This was the ideal method of ensuring a popular morality where political and social change were channelled according to God's will. Great store was placed therefore on individual independence. This world view had its intellectual origins in the experience of religious and political exclusion, and was therefore held most strongly by those outside the locus of political power.[1]

Mid-Victorian liberalism was fundamentally concerned with the distribution of political power, as a corollary of the omnipresent belief in individual independence. This was

---

[1] Parry p 246. He perceives the origins of this dictum, which he calls 'Gladstonianism', in 'Positivism'. Positivism is the belief that spiritual power must be separated from the temporal. Positivists believed that spiritual power was held in thrall by the rich and powerful. The materialism of the wealthy, and their concept of religion as a mechanism of social control prevented spiritual belief generating social consciousness, and therefore being an effective mechanism of social change. The positivist idea of government thus is one where no class or sect posseses illegitimate authority over any other. (p 240)

because the state was perceived to be the most appropriate means of obtaining the regulative and moral framework necessary to secure such an independence. Consequently, politically influencing the state became a central preoccupation with those for whom independence was a primary social value - particularly the petty bourgeoisie. This took a direct form in participation in local government, and an indirect form in extra-parliamentary reformist pressure groups concerned with the exercise of political power.

The expectation was that the state (as a manifestation of unwarranted collective control) would eventually wither away. Liberals therefore endeavoured to reduce the power of the state by reducing citizens' claims upon it.[2] In the intermediate term, however, the mid-Victorian state did not wither, and indeed became more closely integrated into people's lives than ever before. This was because of a changing perception of the role and function of the state - a factor, which with the new moral dimension, differentiated mid-Victorian liberalism from the earlier radicalism more than anything else. Instead of being regarded as an inconvenient and arbitrary vehicle of aristocratic control as it had been in the preceding radical period, the state was now coming to be seen as the impartial and rational manager of public affairs, the representative and protector of the people, and able and willing to ensure collective and individual rights. The state's function was to refrain from moral guidance, but intervene in other contexts to prevent the operation of vested interests or privilege that could constrain free development. Its role was fundamentally to ensure fair play in the market place. Education was one such context, where the institution of an encompassing state system was seen as providing the means to self improvement. Although the normative ethos was laissez-faire therefore, its ultimate expression was moderated (or delayed) by a demand for state intervention to eliminate all manifestations of arbitrariness and undue privilege, foster moral virtues, and thereby provide a 'level playing field' on which the individual could maximize

---

[2] B. Harrison *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-72* London: Faber and Faber, 1971. p 295

their independence.[3] Without any political basis for class antipathy, the mid-Victorian ideal was social (and therefore) class harmony.

Liberals became involved (as we have seen) in politics with the divinely sanctioned mission of implementing their ideals. It has been argued, however, that a central problem of liberal politics was its idealism. Hamer suggests that this political culture was not governed by any particular or relevant system of thought that was capable of guiding political practice. Without any central core principle or belief, liberal politics therefore tended towards confusion and incoherence.[4] 'Gladstonianism' liberalism, admits Parrry, was functionally vague, and seldom possessed a detailed policy platform. This was because it was addressing not a temporal problem, but a spiritual solution for class harmony and equality. Factions did not necessarily cohere on the means of achieving this utopian end - radicals, for example, wishing the destruction of institutions (which was an anathema to moderates such as Gladstone) - but there was broad agreement on the necessary outcome of a more liberal society.[5]

In Britain, according to Hamer, liberal politics comprised of two types of sectional opinion. These were the permanent blocs of regional, occupational, and religious interest; and the more provisional reform organisations. The support of the permanent blocs did not depend on the advocacy of any particular programme or reform policy. The support of the reform organizations, such as pressure groups and lobbies, was more provisional because it depended on the securing of a particular reform.

Hamer declares British liberal politics to have been particularly the product of a grand alliance between two of the permanent blocs, the interests of non-conformity and labour. Non-conformity was fundamentally important to the liberal frame of mind because it engendered political action. This political action had diversified in mid-Victorian Britain so that non-conformist energies, and religious and social impulses were being channelled into a

---

[3] A. Dingle *The Campaign for Prohibition in Victorian England* London: Croom Helm, 1980. p 19; Harrison pp 292, 295.
[4] D. Hamer *Liberal Politics* 1972. p xi . Biagini rejects this assertion, see chapter one.
[5] Parry pp 255-256, 447, 451

variety of good causes. The cohesive power of non-conformity was apparently becoming weaker, however.[6]

The other great interest, that Hamer terms 'Labour', was conversely becoming stronger, more unified, and the best integrated of the Liberal constituencies.[7] It was, he notes, caught between two opposing trends, integration and independence. The increasing significance of independence contributed towards a growth away from Liberal politics after 1867 - although this separation was slow and only apparent from the late 1880s. The separation proceeded slowly because Labour lacked an alternative ideology to those ideas and assumptions, and (particularly) the system of attitudes to capitalism, upon which its integration into Liberal politics was based.[8] This philosophical omnipotence was problematic for workingmen, for it can be perceived to have been simultaneously both beneficial for, and restrictive of, the representation of their interests.

The problem was basically that liberalism provided both a basis for political action and constrained that action within certain boundaries. The liberal world view encouraged political participation because it built on the old radical view that a fair resource distribution depended on the equitable distribution of political power to all social interests. Working men were thus motivated to capture their quotient. The difficulty, however, was that under liberalism, the state became a more neutral agency charged with the removal of obstacles to social advancement. This emphasis of liberalism on the state as a benevolent regulator tended to subsume rather than encourage the identification of separate and incompatible class interests, and therefore engendered class conciliation. The mid-Victorians believed passionately in the reality of a grand alliance of productive interests that largely transcended the antagonisms of class - other, that is, than a common antipathy towards the non-productive landed class. As a consequence, values and aspirations became increasingly convergent across society in the period to about 1885. Workingmen, therefore, were motivated to

---

[6] See chapter five for more on the significance of non-conformity for liberalism.
[7] I assume Hamer is referring to the politically active skilled artisan. "Labour" is something of a misnomer.
[8] Hamer *Liberal Politics* 1972, comments that the socialist challege to the liberal capitalist consensus was accepted slowly by organised labour. p 11.

participate politically, but with respectably reformist rather than revolutionary aims. This transition to the liberal consensus was not always fully enacted, however, and various philosophical permutations and degrees of antagonism remained in the 1860s.[9]

The support of the reform organizations such as the temperance movement may have been contingent on outcomes, and therefore tenuous. It was these reform organizations, however, that Hamer points out were 'the very stuff of activist liberal politics' because they symbolically represented liberal attitudes in the absence of a coherent programme, and were thus the reason many called themselves Liberals. He is careful nonetheless to underline the lack of any permanent division between the permanent and the provisional blocs because the permanent was a fertile breeding ground for the sectionalism of the particular provisional cause.

The proliferation of reformist extra-parliamentary pressure groups was an outcome of the discourse of the state and political power.[10] These were considered appropriate vehicles for the exercise of political influence because of the liberal desire for moral progress, and the belief in popular control. The belief in moral progress grew from the liberal desire to eliminate any factor which could weaken self-dependence. As a consequence the temperance movement, and other self-help bodies, were at the forefront of these pressure groups.[11] The public meeting was a central feature of most reforming campaigns because it was a way of attracting and demonstrating the extent of that support to the political decision makers. It also functioned as a device for maintaining morale.[12]

---

[9] This is based broadly on Hamer *Liberal Politics* pp 2-24. See chapter one for explanation of the discontinuity argument. Large demonstrations took place in Britain during the mid 1860's in order that workingmen could demonstrate their respectability and prove their moral right to possess the franchise. But, writes F. Smith ; ' the motivation behind the meetings as expressed in the speeches and the petitions served to narrow their impact on the [Reform] Bill'. Smith considers therefore that the demonstrations served neither to precipitate nor shape the enfranchising 1867 Reform Act. He does state however that the acceptance of the bill by "country gentlemen" depended very much on their confidence in the submissiveness of the workingman. F. Smith *The Making of the Second Reform Bill* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1966 . pp 230, 234.

[10] Dingle p 9

[11] Harrison pp 291, 293. These feature in chapter five.

[12] Dingle pp 205, 208

Another outcome of political liberalism and the desire for independence was an emphasis on local self determination, especially through municipal government. This was not only a means of strengthening and extending local initiative, but also an achievable way of attacking the privileged governing classes.[13]

Political Liberalism in New Zealand

Colonial New Zealand has been seen as the epitome of a liberal nation because of the broad currency of the liberal ethos at the time of settlement. This country offered the potential to fulfil the liberal goals of the mid-Victorian workman. Remaining in Britain meant struggling against inequality, domination, and vested interest. By contrast, the central attraction of the colonies was the possibility of 'getting on' through the exercise of personal qualities, and without undue impediment. Equality of opportunity therefore assumed relatively greater significance than in Britain. The close association between the idea of independence and the idealization of pre-industrial rural life also saw a great emphasis placed on land and land access.[14] Popular politics in New Zealand were therefore part of an on-going drive to fulfil the liberal promise.

As noted above, one perception has been that the heterogeneity of liberalism in terms of its diversity of constituent ideologies rendered it irrelevant to, and incapable of, practical application. On this basis a so-called 'problem' of colonial liberalism has been deduced. This postulates that colonists emigrated with an 'authentic' liberalism as part of their cultural baggage, but that this genuine interest in fundamental principles was inevitably attenuated by the exigencies of colonial circumstance into a pragmatic pursuit of personal advantage guided by only vaguely liberal ideas. Colonial liberalism was therefore deficient and derivative. McIntyre observes two problems with this thesis. Firstly the concept is oxymoronic, for the idea of a watered-down, derivative colonial liberalism is dependent on a perception that liberalism was a fixed concept. But it is the very amorphousness of liberal values that Hamer and others argue makes them practically inapplicable. How then could there be a derivative

---

[13] ibid p 20

[14] Hamer *The New Zealand Liberals* 1988, pp 57, 64-72

version? The second problem is one of definition. Like Hamer, McIntyre considers that political liberalism was neither fixed nor coherent. However, nor was it directly prescriptive, but rather a broad framework of ideas; a way of seeing the world and acting in it. Colonial liberalism was not therefore deficient, but had simply shed the connotations of opposition it held in the old country, and became a positive force in the building of a new society.[15]

In Britain the political base of liberalism was in the new industrial towns, where the hold of traditional relations of class and status was weak. The political support base of the late nineteenth century New Zealand Liberal party was in the colonial equivalent of these industrial towns, in what Hamer terms the urban frontier. Colonial liberalism was therefore also dependent on a 'town way of life', which involved such factors as a vigorous associational life which could resist the incursion of farmer-oriented politics; leadership of community affairs by tradesmen and storekeepers (the petty bourgeoisie); and energetic and ambitious businessmen. This thesis purports to show that the support base of liberal politics in mid-Victorian Christchurch was not dissimilar.[16]

At least one group of petty bourgeois 'workingmen' in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand - those of Nelson were able to promote their brand of radical/liberal ideology through the political process. Jim McAloon finds that what he calls 'artisan radicalism' was a major influence on provincial politics in Nelson. This influence was pervasive partly because its settlers were predominately artisans and labourers, and because the geography of the settlement made it more suitable for small farming than extensive pastoralism. Consequently, the large landholders did not have the same opportunity to become economically and politically dominant as they did elsewhere in New Zealand. Nelson's artisans became a political force during the economic crisis of the province during the 1840s, and remained so through the 1850s. Issues which they as a body found pertinent to discuss were representative government and the constitution, economical administration, cheap land, and a

---

[15] S. McIntyre, *A Colonial Liberalism; the World of Three Victorian Visonaries* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. pp 11-12

[16] Hamer *The New Zealand Liberals* 1988, pp 150-151

comprehensive education system. In 1856 they succeeded in electing J. P. Robinson, a wood-turner and former Birmingham radical of the 1830s, to the position of superintendent. Some progressive legislation was enacted, but Robinson's vision of a direct democracy of small producers was stymied by the social and political conservatism of the provincial elite, and of the general assembly.[17]

In Canterbury, political life was dominated by large landholders, a wealthy gentry of pastoralists and farmers. This dominion was indicated by a disproportionate degree of representation in the provincial council, where the majority of members were of this class. As a consequence, although the council was not always politically united, it was never seriously ideologically divided. The executive and opposition certainly developed distinct and opposing identities during the 1860s, but these identities were centred as much on individual issues and personalities as on political complexion.[18] Politics were focused primarily on competing for infrastructural development. Therefore most of the struggles in the provincial council were fought over railways and communications.[19] Eldred-Grigg considers that the political self-interest of this landed class was tempered to some degree by what he calls 'vague ideas of social duty'. More 'liberal' factions existing within the council thus included some landowners.[20]

If one considers the apparent degree of political domination by an elite, the almost universal nature of male suffrage in Canterbury in the 1860s (in contrast to Britain) comes as something of a revelation.[21] The preservation of elite dominion was accomplished through a variety of means, including unproportionate electorates, subtle social pressure, and traditional

---

[17] J. McAloon, 'Artisan Democracy' 1997, pp 16-21.

[18] Hensley believes that in the first provincial council of 1854, the legislators were divided by a subtle cleavage into an upper and a lower class. The upper were comprised of original Canterbury Association purchasers or those with a good family background, who together formed a cohesive social group that automatically assumed the mantle of an elite. The lower consisted of those who were less accepted. Hensley's implication is that this division was perpetuated in later provincial councils, though there is little evidence of this. G. Hensley 'Canterbury 1853-57: The Superintendency of J. E. Fitzgerald'. *A History of Canterbury:* vol. II, 1971. p 19.

[19] W. Scotter 'Canterbury, 1857-68' ibid, pp 191, 243.

[20] S. Eldred-Grigg*A Southern Gentry* Auckland: Heinemann Reed, 1980. p 66.

[21] Eldred-Grigg, in writing of the South Island as a whole, considered that the popular electorate was small. In Canterbury at least, this was not the case. ibid pp 57, 59.

deference. Another under-estimated factor which may have impacted on electoral behaviour was the omnipotence of the liberal paradigm, and the difficulties this created for the articulation of differential interests. In the country areas, amongst the rural proletariat and small farmers, many of these factors were accentuated by close and dependent economic and social relations with the local landowners. This must have contributed in no small part to the degree of overall political apathy evident at the time. In the 1866 provincial election, only thirteen percent of adult men in Canterbury cast a vote.[22]

Nevertheless, the popular vote did have an impact on provincial politics, for significant influence was wielded in the urban electorates by the petty bourgeoisie. As well as being more economically and socially independent than their rural countrymen, they were also more politically aware. That all three candidates for the superintendency in 1866 saw fit to present themselves and their policies before the local Working Man's Association is perhaps one indicator of its perceived importance. The actual political influence of the Christchurch petty bourgeoisie is difficult to estimate however. In absolute terms, it depends very much on the size of the class relative to other sectors of the population. If the population estimate used in chapter one is valid, then it is fairly safe to assume that the great majority of city electors, and perhaps as many as half of the total provincial electors were petty bourgeois. The potential political force that this represented was lessened, however, by the disproportionate number of rural electorates, and plural voting.

Petty Bourgeois Liberalism in Christchurch; the Working Man's Association

The concept behind the formation of the Canterbury Working Man's Association had its origins in early nineteenth-century popular radicalism. In 1831, a popular radical body known as the National Union of the Working Classes was formed. The aims of the Union were originally economic as much as political, but circumstances saw the political emphasized. With the failure of the 1832 Reform Act to enfranchise the majority of workmen, recruits flocked to the Union, and a number of similar bodies were formed in the

---

[22] ibid, pp 58-9. Also see Martin *The Forgotten Worker* 1990. pp1-4.

provinces. In 1836, the National Union was reborn as the London Working Men's Association. Its secretary and treasurer were both tradesmen; a cabinet maker and printer respectively. This, says Kelly, was typical of working-class (or more accurately popular) leadership. The political aims of the Association were largely inherited from the National Union, and were expressed in the six points of the famous Peoples Charter. These included universal suffrage, vote by ballot, equal representation, annual parliaments, and no property qualification for members of parliament. Education was also a high priority. The Working Men's Association soon spawned imitators in many parts of the country with the Charter as their creed; and the Chartist movement was born.[23]

A Working Man's Association was established in Christchurch at the end of 1865, precipitated by depression and the impending election. It seems likely that the Christchurch association was consciously imitative of its famous English namesake. Like its namesake, the identifiable membership consisted of artisans and shopkeepers - though probably never more than a few dozen. As such, the association was probably the first formal body in the city to articulate the demands of the petty bourgeoisie.[24] Unlike its progenitor, however, the Christchurch WMA was arguably more liberal than radical in political complexion. Contemporary discussion within and about the association can serve, therefore, to illuminate the spectrum of liberal political thought in the province at this time.

The self declared aims of the Christchurch WMA were, like its parent body, primarily political and self improving. At its first meeting in December 1865, at which a president, secretary, and a nine member 'committee of management' were appointed from amongst those assembled, the chairman A. Mason proclaimed the object of formation 'which was to devise means for advancing the welfare of the working classes to enable them to take part in the great political questions of the day'.[25] This objective was clarified by its secretary,

---

[23] T. Kelly *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain; from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992. pp 138-140.

[24] The Canterbury Working Man's Association was not the first body in New Zealand to adopt the name, an association having been formed in Wellington in 1840, only four years after the establishment of the parent institution. Roth and Hammond, *Toil and Trouble* 1981. p 14

[25] *Lyttelton Times* 2 December, 1865

John St Quentin, six months later, when he explained that the association had been formed 'not merely for political purposes, but with the higher views of moral and social improvement...'. He then proclaimed, 'Let the people show by calm forbearance, and steady patience that they were disposed to bring an earnest consideration to any measures which might be brought before them by their rulers'. The association had been formed thus, not so much with a view to directly challenging the elite for political power, but rather with the liberal idea of 'improving' its membership in terms of both their political competency and their 'respectability', so as to demonstrate their worthiness to take a full part in the political process.[26]

The range of issues that the Working Man's Association planned to discuss encompassed the gamut of mid-Victorian petty bourgeois liberal concerns. At the inaugural meeting of the association, St Quentin spoke in support of universal manhood suffrage, compulsory education, and attacked indirect taxation for the burden it placed on the working man.[27] Nine months later, it was reported that the association had discussed the secret ballot, concluding that it was necessary for the protection of all classes, and that it would endeavour to bring about its establishment at provincial and national levels.[28] Other issues aired during discussion apparently included the rate of wages, immigration, land policy, and temperance (the Permissive Bill).[29] Despite the best intentions of the association, however, many of these issues do not appear to have been discussed at length, or indeed at all - although it is possible that they went unreported. This disjunction between intention and reality was partly a function of the comparatively short life of the Association, but mainly a consequence of the

---

[26] ibid 15 June 1866. British workingmen 'occupiers' (but not the majority of so-called 'lodgers' [renters]) were enfranchised by the second Reform Bill of 1867. An English contemporary suggested in 1868 that if workingmen were to receive the full benefit of their recent enfranchisement, they would have to adopt a 'holier than thou' attitude to indisputably prove their worthiness. Thus 'While seeking to benefit themselves as a class, they should not do so in a class spirit, but solely on grounds of general justice'. Compare this with this the rhetoric of the *Lyttelton Times* (below). T. Wright (the Journeyman Engineer) *The Great Unwashed* London; Frank Cass & Co, 1970. p 55. See also the 'problem' of liberalism (above, & esp. footnote 9) on the manner in which respectability muffled working class dissent.

[27] *Lyttelton Times* 2 December 1865.

[28] ibid 25 July 1866

[29] See chapter two for a fuller discussion of the role of immigration and wages, chapter four for land policy, and chapter five for temperance.

event that had precipitated its formation: the 1866 provincial election. As the object of ensuring sympathetic political representation in the provincial council took precedence in the politically-focused association, so the issues discussed were only those immediately relevant to the assessment of candidates.

In accordance with the local political interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the predominately regional nature of New Zealand politics, the Working Man's Association concerned itself with the affairs of the provincial, not central, government. Municipal government did not feature on its agenda, although a number of members of the association and its off-shoot, the Canterbury Freehold Land Society, were participants at this level.[30] The association initiated its political programme by discussing the comparative merits of the candidates for the superintendency. This was followed by an assessment of the candidates for the provincial council, and an attempt to elect their own representative.

As noted above, the practical application of liberalism was not always easily and automatically discernible from first principles. This has led to a certain degree of misinterpretation. Eldred-Grigg, for example, depicts the liberalism of the superintendents as simply demagoguery, without substance.[31] There are two problems with this view however. Firstly, it pre-supposes a politically naive electorate. This does not explain the sustained popularity of Moorhouse, and his successor Rolleston, amongst the politically aware urban petty bourgeoisie. If it is accepted that this electorate was broadly liberal in complexion, then the expectation is that these popularly elected political masters must also have been committed to the ethos. The second, related problem is that Eldred-Grigg depends on a narrow, mechanistic interpretation of liberalism. He is troubled because of what he perceives as a disjunction between intention and action. If it is accepted, however, that liberalism could find expression in a variety of forms and points of view, then the problem vanishes.

The puzzle of what political liberalism may have meant, in practical terms, to different sectors of society in colonial Canterbury can perhaps be clarified by reference to the

---

[30] See below.
[31] S. Eldred-Grigg *Southern Gentry* 1980, p 60.

two broad positions distinguished in English liberalism by Parry: 'Whig' or elite liberalism, and 'Popular' liberalism. "Whig" liberals maintained the affairs of the state should ideally be conducted by rational, high-minded, unselfish, and generally responsible politicians who would cooperate in order to promote practical and sober measures. Government should therefore be by the educated - not by demagogues, sectionalists, or ecclesiastics, who would promote divisive and populist legislation that would forment class and sectional hatred.[32] 'Popular' or petty bourgeois liberals by contrast (as we have seen) participated politically primarily because it confirmed their dignity and social equality, and potentially secured their independence; but also because it translated into social status, and gave them the confidence to assert power against other socio-economic groups.[33]

Two of the three candidates for the superintendency, Travers and Moorhouse, may be seen, in a colonial context, to be Whig Liberals. The Working Man's Association, by contrast, represent the popular form, and were clearly looking for a liberal figure who would make a commitment to ensuring them equal representation, and the abolition of unfair social and economic privilege - particularly that of the squatters'. In the discussion attending provincial council candidates, the same liberal selection criteria were applied. Needless to say, the 'Whig' Liberals were dependent on the 'popular' liberals for office, which required a certain targeting of policies on the candidates' behalf. This representation of policy was not implicitly untruthful, contradictory, or superficial; as both positions were ultimately liberal, and therefore not mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, Whig liberalism has a certain internal tension or neurosis, for although ostensibly committed to equitable treatment of all, it also depended for correct functioning on the balance of power being held by the elite. This is best illustrated by the contemporary commentary of the *Lyttelton Times*.- discussed below.

Among the three candidates for the provincial superintendency, James Dupre Lance was the only contender who was philosophically outside the liberal discourse. Although he stood as a self styled 'independent conservative', it was no secret that the North Canterbury

---

[32] Parry p 451
[33] ibid p 447

pastoralist was the favoured candidate of runholders. Indeed, the conservative, class-conscious, paternal, and patronizing Lance was the antithesis of everything that liberalism represented. Although he had the support of members of the government party, his cautious unimaginative programme, and illiberal stance determined that he only ever had an outside chance.[34]

The Working Man's Association considered Lance on the basis of his 'class' position. Two members defended Lance for his gentlemanly character, and his paternal concern for his workers whom he enabled to settle informally on his land. This however was a red rag to other more liberal constituents, with their focus on the encouragement of independence and the elimination of unequal patron/client relations. Lance therefore received a roasting from ten WMA members who expressed an antipathy towards the form of 'feudal tenure' that Lance encouraged on his lands, and his conservative social stance. According to the *Lyttelton Times*, John Cutler made some sarcastic remarks about Lance, and then summarized the association position by pleading for the equality of all 'interests' in the province. Most members made reference to Lance's class position, seeing it as inimical to their own liberal interests. Samuel Andrews insisted that 'Mr Lance was essentially a man of class or caste, and he thought that a man of such narrow sympathies was most objectionable for Superintendent'. Likewise Lawrence was of the opinion 'that Mr Lance did not recognize the advancement of the working classes [and that] He could not vote for a man as superintendent who believed in [such a] finality.' Lance's traditional paternal attitude to his workmen was regarded as particularly offensive. William Barnes recounted the case of a

---

[34] Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. p 148. J. D. Lance (1829-97), a lieutenent in the East India Company, first visited Canterbury whilst on leave in 1855. He returned in 1860, and briefly held the Four Peaks run before returning to England to marry. In 1862, he again returned to Canterbury, and took up a partnership in the Horsley Down and Heathstock runs in North Canterbury. Lance entered provincial politics in 1865, succeeding his brother H. P. Lance, and was elected to the Legislative Council in the same year. After his failure to win the superintendency in 1866, he suffered an accident, and resigned his place in the Legislative Council in 1867 to return to England for treatment. Lance remained overseas until 1879, when he returned to North Canterbury and resumed his career as a prominent citizen. Elected to the House of Representatives for Cheviot in 1884 as a supporter of Vogel, he took a leading role in opposition politics in 1888-9. After Ballance became leader of the opposition, however, Lance surrendered his position because of his opposition to Ballance's land and taxation policies. He lost his seat in 1890. *DNZB* vol. II, p 262.

workman who had asked Lance for work, and who had 'in reply been taxed with having attended a meeting of working men who had sought to get a grievance addressed. Mr Lance', he continued, 'might be willing to help working men, but the moment they attempted to help themselves he was offended. It was better to be without such help'.[35] Mansell expressed similar sentiments: 'Mr Lance was a man who would give them plenty of beef and beer, but would prevent them having any mind. He would be a father to them, but they would always be children'. Charles Worth, one of the two Lance apologists, proposed a resolution giving the candidate association support. This was amended by John St. Quentin to say that if Lance were elected, it would be 'to the prejudice of the province'. The amended motion was carried by a large majority.[36]

The consideration of superintendency candidate William Thomas Locke Travers centred on his two part land platform. This platform was to turn land policy and its abuses into the pre-eminent issue of the entire election. Land as a factor assumed an inordinate importance because it represented independence, a basic value for liberalism. Travers' views thus occasioned much debate. The first part of Travers' platform proposed the reform of land sale regulations in order to bring more capital and people into the province. The second, unrelated proposal was to reform the land regulations to prevent their abuse by pastoralists. The initial proposal, to encourage land sales, received a largely negative reaction from the association. Members opposed the scheme because they believed it would benefit squatters only, would alienate land from the populace, and encourage unnecessary immigration. Perhaps they perceived this as a greater degree of state intervention than was desirable in the quest for a level playing field, unfairly benefiting squatters at their expense.

The second feature of Travers' platform was of much greater interest to the liberal petty bourgeois membership. This was the proposal to reform the pre-emptive right of purchase that pastoralists were able to exercise over their runs. Travers was largely

---

[35] Barnes had called two meetings of workmen in September 1859 in order to discuss the prevailing depression and potential relief measures. He may be referring therefore to the experience of an attender of these meetings, or obliquely to his own experience. See *DNZB* vol. I p 16; and chapter two.

[36] *Lyttelton Times* 1 March 1866

responsible for bringing the apparently extensive abuse of this privilege to the publics' attention. Association members, with their liberal concern for the elimination of unfair advantage and land monopoly, supported this initiative wholeheartedly and passed a motion against any candidate who did not favour reform.[37]

The last of the superintendency candidates to be considered, the charismatic and populist William Sefton Moorhouse, elicited a divided response from the Association. Those members who favoured Moorhouse did so because of what they regarded as his equitable, liberal stance. John St Quentin, a strong Moorhouse supporter, insisted that the candidate would not allow the government to fall into the hands of a 'clique' who would grind down the working man; he would oppose immigration, and would, like Travers, change the pre-emptive right. Gadd attacked the existing provincial government for having spent in a 'useless and extravagant manner, and having done all they could to grind down the workingman'.

Those expressing opposition to the re-election of the former superintendent blamed him for being too interventionist to be a good liberal. Moorhouse was castigated successively for causing the episode of 'distress' in 1859 through his agreement to the introduction of unnecessary labour; for being in the 'squatters interest' and initiating the extension of squatters' leases; and simply for being too 'profuse', making 'too many promises' and being 'unfit'.[38] This debate thus reflects the diversity of liberal political opinion amongst the local

---

[37] ibid 14 February 1866, 21 March 1866. See chapter four for a more extensive analysis of Travers and his scheme. Irish born William Thomas Locke Travers (1819-1903) grew up in France, where his military officer father had retired. In 1835, he joined the British Foreign Legion, with which he served in Spain until 1838. He was admmitted to the bar in 1844, and practised law until his emigration to Nelson in 1849, where he served as resident magistrate. Later he was to practise law in Christchurch and Wellington. Travers was elected to the House of Representatives for Nelson in 1853-54, and Waimea in 1854-59, and stood unsuccessfully for the Nelson Superintendency in 1855. During the mid 1860s, he shifted to Christchurch, where he stood unsuccessfully for the superintendency in 1866, served on the provincial council in 1867, and represented Christchurch in the House of Representatives in 1867-70. In the early 1870s, Travers moved to Wellington, which he represented in the House of Representatives in 1877-78. It was outside politics that Travers had his largest impact however; he was notable for exploring the Nelson region, and for his interest in natural history. A collector of botanical specimens, he was a founder in 1867 of the New Zealand Institute (for which he wrote a number of scientific papers), and the Wellington Acclimatisation Society. Travers was also a keen Volunteer in Nelson and Canterbury. He died as the result of a railway accident. *DNZB* vol. II pp 547-8

[38] Those opposed to Moorhouse included prominent members Charles Worth, John Cutler, Dr Augustus Florance, Samuel Andrews, and Lawrence. For analysis of the labour/immigration problem, see chapter two;

petty bourgeoisie as to what constituted necessary and sufficient government intervention. It also demonstrates the tension between what might generally constitute sufficient state intervention for the petty bourgeois; and the potential incompatibility of this notion with what the 'Whig' liberal provincial government regarded as being in the best interests of the local economy.

Moorhouse's supporters responded to each of the charges levelled against him. William Barnes claimed the 1859 distress was not Moorhouse's doing: 'it was rather the fault of the public at large', and that Moorhouse had attended the Barnes' meeting, after which he 'did his best to get over the crisis'. Ford, who said that he had also attended that meeting, blamed the crisis on J. E. Fitzgerald, the former superintendent. Another member considered Moorhouse to have rescued the province from bankruptcy. Barnes also contended that Moorhouse had been right to extend the squatters' leases because of the province's economic dependence on wool. He then moved a motion that the association lend its support to Moorhouse, which was carried by a small majority.[39]

---

and the squatter problem, chapter four.

[39] *Lyttelton Times* 7 March 1866 In the event, Moorhouse won the election for superintendent, with 1, 604 votes. Lance polled second with half this number (891), whilst Travers came a distant third with 186 (ibid 9 June 1866). William Sefton Moorhouse (1825-81) was born in Yorkshire in 1825, the son of a magistrate. In his youth he went to sea on colliers, and then studied law, being called to the Bar in 1849. In 1851, William and two brothers emigrated to Canterbury. William was admitted to the bar in Wellington in 1852, but returned to Christchurch in 1853, when he purchased a brig, in which he traded with Australia. His political career began in 1853, when he backed Col. Campbell against J. E. Fitzgerald in the contest for the superintendency, and stood unsuccessfully for the provincial council. Later that year, Moorhouse and his brothers sailed for the Victorian goldfields where they stayed until 1855, apart for a brief visit to Auckland in 1854, to represent Akaroa in the General Assembly. On his return to Canterbury, Moorhouse was a provincial councillor until 1857, when he was elected to the superintendency. Announcing plans to build a railway tunnel, he clashed with former superintendent Fitzgerald. In 1861, nemesis Fitzgerald founded the *Press* to oppose Moorhouse and the tunnel. Re-elected in 1861, and unopposed in 1862, Moorhouse caused difficulties for himself in council by acquiring land for provincial development by unorthodox means. H. Sewell remarked, however, that Moorhouse had complete 'command of the democracy'. Resigning in 1863 because of financial difficulties, Moorhouse re-entered the council later the same year for Kaiapoi. Although representing Westland in the House of Representatives from 1865-68, he was re-elected superintendent of Canterbury in 1866. This term he found particularly difficult because of differences with the council over the superintendent's powers, and unauthorized expenditure. In 1868, Moorhouse again resigned because of personal financial problems, and lost badly when standing against Rolleston in 1870. Later that year he became Registrar of Crown Lands, but gave the post up in 1872 to unsuccessfully contest the seat of Egmont. Elected mayor of Wellington in 1874, he represented Christchurch (1875-9) and Ashley (1879-81) in the House of Representatives. William Moorhouse died of diabetes related illness. *DNZB* vol II, pp 297-8

Liberalism is sometimes seen as a monolithic political ideology. If this chapter shows anything, it is the range of view points encompassed within liberal bounds. Scotter regards the central difference between Moorhouse and his successor William Rolleston as the respective importance each proscribed to immigration and public works. Moorhouse regarded public works as a priority; Rolleston desired public works and immigration to be run concurrently.[40] At a more significant level however, they may be seen to represent two facets of 'Whig' liberalism, two sides of the debate on how the state could best facilitate the level playing field. The 'progressive' Moorhouse perceived state intervention in the development of provincial infrastructure as the ideal way of creating a liberal polity where all citizens had equitable access to resources, and therefore the same opportunity for the attainment of an independence. This however neglected the regulatory aspect of the state's function under the liberal formulation; and the wealth of the squatters was, thus, gained and maintained by privilege rather than by individual achievement.[41] This did not matter whilst public works forged ahead, and the ideal liberal polity of independent small producers seemed achievable. Once the economy stagnated, however, and public works halted, independence seemed to slip out of reach, and inequitable bases of wealth became more important as a symbol of illiberal obstruction. This could explain Moorhouse's approach to the superintendency campaign of 1870, where he fought a defensive action and played the demagogue, blatantly attacking merchants and squatters. By contrast Rolleston, an opponent of pastoral hegemony and a cautious and able administrator, emphasized the regulatory path to equality of opportunity - at the expense of Moorhouse's ailing developmental approach. This interpretation was more in tune with the mood of 1868, when Rolleston came to power. Even when the economy began to revive after 1869, Moorhouse remained out of favour.

After the election for the superintendency, the Working Man's Association decided in April 1866 to scrutinize candidates for the provincial council. This provoked an attack

---

[40] Scotter 'Canterbury 1868-76' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. p 263.
[41] Such as the extention of the squatters' leases by Moorhouse.

from the *Lyttelton Times*.[42] Much of this scrutiny seems to have been directed at the association's own candidate, Samuel Andrews.[43] Following his defeat in the Christchurch City seat, however, a June meeting was devoted to assessing candidates for the Heathcote electorate. The meeting considered George Allen, William Montgomery, Thomas Maude, Canterbury Freehold Land Society member John Jebson, and Joshua Williams. Allen was favoured 'as a proper representative of the working classes' for having 'worked his way up'; favouring the ballot, and opposing the pre-emptive right.[44] Supporting Williams, St Quentin remarked bitterly on how the 'upper classes had flattered the workingmen lately, but having attained their objects, had thrown them overboard'. He considered, however, that Williams had 'stuck to his word, and opposed the upper class'.[45] G. Lawrence favoured Maude, for his experience in public affairs, and Jebson - although that candidate opposed the secret ballot.[46] The meeting endorsed Williams and Allen, although Montgomery and Williams were subsequently elected.[47] Given Montgomery's later liberal political credentials, it is

---

[42] *Lyttelton Times* 7 April 1866. See below.

[43] Edmund Bohan states incorrectly that Andrews stood for the provincial council in 1867. See *DNZB* vol. II, p 7

[44]Allen was probably George W. Allen (1836-1914) a painter and early Christchurch Congregationalist who arrived in 1863.

[45] Joshua Strange Williams was a barrister who arrived in Christchurch in 1861, entering into partnership with solicitor T. S. Duncan until 1864 . He replaced Duncan as provincial solicitor in 1863. Williams was elected for Heathcote in 1862-64, and 1866-70, and served on the provincial executive in 1863 and 1866-68. In 1875 he was appointed to the Supreme Court of New Zealand, and moved to Dunedin. From 1895-98 he was first president of the Court of Arbitration. A man of integrity, he saw this as a powerful means of improving the conditions of the masses, and protecting them from oppression. In 1914, Williams became New Zealand's first permanent representative on the Privy Council. Like Montgomery, he had an interest in education; serving as first chairman of the board of governors of Canterbury College and Chancellor of the University of Otago. *DNZB* vol. II, pp 579-80

[46] Thomas Maude was an experienced provincial politician and public servant. He represented Ashley in the provincial council in 1861, Sefton in 1866, Heathcote in 1866-67, and Rangiora in 1873-76. He was provincial secretary 1861-63, and 1874; registrar of births, deaths, and marriages - and electors; receiver of land revenue; and a commissioner in and treasurer of the Waste Lands Board. *McDonald Dictionary*

[47] *Lyttelton Times* and Press 27 June 1866. William Montgomery was a former sea captain who set up as a timber and general merchant in 1860. He entered politics as a member of the Heathcote Roads Board in 1864. Following his election to the provincial council in 1866, he filled a number of posts including provincial treasurer, and member and leader of the provincial executive. In 1874 he was elected to the General Assembly for Akaroa, which he represented until 1887. During this period he opposed the abolition of the provinces, and pushed for the financial separation of the South Island. In 1882, he was elected leader of the opposition, and in 1884 became colonial secretary and minister of education in the first Stout-Vogel ministry. Ballance called him to the Legislative Council in 1892, where as the elder statesman of the Liberals, he served until 1907. He was also a member of the Seddon cabinet in 1893-95. Montgomery played a leading role in the development of New Zealands public education system. *DNZB* vol. II, p 332

perhaps surprizing that his candidacy did not occasion more discussion in the WMA. Perhaps he was still an unknown quantity at this stage of his career.

What particularly distinguishes the 1866 provincial election is that it appears to be the first time in Canterbury that a self proclaimed 'workingman' had stood for the provincial council.[48] It would seem that this was directly attributable to the organisation and support provided by Working Men's Association, though perhaps immediately prompted by an attack from the *Lyttelton Times* on the liberality of the body.[49] The candidate, for the City of Christchurch seat was prominent association member, plasterer Samuel Paul Andrews.[50] His selection was first debated by the Association in April 1866. William Barnes, blacksmith and Association secretary, who had that night put forward the name of J. G. Hawkes as a candidate worthy of association support, objected to Andrews because he had entered the race too late.[51] St. Quentin sprang to Andrews' defence, pointing out 'that if working men were not put into the Council now, they would have to wait another five years for another opportunity.' Several others lent their support to Andrews because of his identification as a 'working man'.[52]

Barnes was evidently still uncomfortable with the support that the Association was giving Andrews, however. About two months after Andrews entered the running, a meeting was convened in order to discuss a letter from Barnes to the Christchurch paper, the *Evening Mail,* in which he claimed that Andrews had not been endorsed by the Association. Andrews admitted at the meeting that he had not been formally put forward by the Association, but considered that 'had he not received encouragement from the association, he would not have

---

[48] It is curious to consider that Andrews was considered by contempories as the first 'workingman', in light of the membership of the provincial council by Rowland Davis during the 1850's (see footnote, chapter five). This serves perhaps to illustrate the importance of self perception in class affiliation.

[49] See below

[50] The name has on occasion been spelt 'Paull'.

[51] J. G. Hawkes, an ironmonger by trade, was in business with the architect Frederick Strouts. The company dealt in ironmongery and general importing; and offered its services as a land and commission agency, and architectural and surveying practice. Hawkes entered the provincial council in 1866 and was returned in 1870, although he resigned following a bankruptcy in 1872. He was a member of the committee that was convened in August 1867 to enquire into unemployment. In 1875 he fought M. B. Hart successfully for a seat on the City Council. Hawkes' petty bourgeois origins may have appealed to the 'workingman' constituency, though Barnes may have supported him because he was in the same line of business. *MacDonald Dictionary*

[52] *Lyttelton Times* 25 April 1866

put himself forward'. St. Quentin insisted that Andrews represented the majority of members, and 'thought the letter calculated to bring the association into disrepute, and to bring schism amongst members'. Cutler moved that the association write to the papers disavowing knowledge of Barnes' actions. In response, Barnes said that 'he believed that two-thirds of the working men of this place did not agree in political opinion with Mr Andrews'. Those at the meeting thought otherwise, and voted ten to two in favour of censuring the errant secretary, who subsequently tendered his resignation. Andrews took over as his replacement.[53]

In the light of Barnes opposition, it is interesting to speculate on why he believed that two-thirds of 'workingmen' did not agree with Andrews. The Working Man's Association met in early July 1866 to consider Andrews' platform. The issues on which he stood were typical petty bourgeois liberal hobby-horses of the period, and should not have been considered particularly novel or unsettling. These included the secret ballot, manhood suffrage, land access, and compulsory secular education.[54] Where Andrews seems to have diverged from the other candidates (and presumably that part to which Barnes and his 'two thirds' objected) was the *extent* to which he was reported to be prepared to go to rework the land regulations for the benefit of the 'workingman'. Included in his platform was a plan for deferred payment for land, which was something very few other candidates were advocating; and the complete abolition of the pre-emptive right. The issue appears to have occupied the Association for the duration of the meeting, to the exclusion of everything else - perhaps confirming the controversial nature of Andrews' approach.[55] Lawrence, association member and the secretary of Andrews' support committee, submitted that Andrews had no wish to injure the squatters, '...who were on the whole, a useful class...'. However he, Gadd, and Mansell all derided the privilege of this group, and lent their support to Andrews' radical

---

[53] ibid 13 June 1866
[54] These issues were not debated at this meeting. See *DNZB* vol. II, pp 7-8
[55] The *Lyttelton Times* also made comment on his radicalism. See below (2 June 1866)

measures. St. Quentin was more cautious in lending his approval, suggesting that the land regulations could be made to work for both squatters and farmers.[56]

In the event, Samuel Andrews was unsuccessful in his bid for a place on the provincial council. He was nominated for the seat by St Quentin, who remarked (to the accompaniment of loud cheers) upon the under-representation of working men in the provincial council in comparison with the 'commercial, professional, and pastoral interests...'. Andrews declared that he 'would look to them [workingmen] for support...'. At the booth, however, Andrews polled sixth out of the seven candidates with 232 votes, half that of the leading contender, the lawyer Francis Garrick with 506. Conceding defeat, Andrews remarked that 'Had his position in society been equal to that of the other candidates, he had no doubt that he would have been among the elected...'.[57] His comparative newness to the hustings on this occasion may also have played a part in the defeat.

Andrews' political career had not ended, though, but only just begun. In 1867 he was co-opted on to the provincial council committee on unemployment. In 1872, Andrews defeated the conservative John Cracroft Wilson in a by-election in the Heathcote seat, and thus on his second attempt became the first workman elected to the provincial council. He was carried through the streets in triumph. In 1874, he was re-elected for the Christchurch seat as the top polling candidate with 454 votes.[58] With only two fewer votes, the second polling candidate, Henry Tancred was also elected. At the next provincial election Andrews stood successfully in partnership with Tancred on an education platform. At the 1875 general election Andrews stood for the City of Christchurch seat, but the workingmen's vote was split by E. J. Wakefield, and Andrews failed to gain election. He was successful in the electorate however at the 1879 election, when he stood as Sir George Greys' running mate, and with the backing of a short-lived Canterbury Liberal Reform Association. Andrews thereby became the first workman elected to the General Assembly. He was not re-elected in

---

[56] ibid 9 May 1866
[57] ibid 14 June 1866. The seventh and lowest polling candidate, with only thirty nine votes, was E. J. Wakefield.
[58] Press 20 April 1874.

1881, and in 1886 failed again when he stood for Sydenham in a by-election. Whilst in the House, Andrews maintained his independence, and did not support Grey on any occasion! He achieved notoriety as the most talkative member, and, with Seddon, as its chief time waster.[59]

Andrews' political standpoints in parliament are revealing of his petty bourgeois intellectual heritage. He wanted workmen to register as voters, advocated longer polling hours, but would accept manhood suffrage only with residential qualifications. He also opposed Grey's land tax, condemned any idea of state secondary or tertiary education, and attacked proposals of sickness pay for railway employees. Bohan concludes from this that Andrews was no more 'liberal' than many of his opponents, and less so than some. Allowing for Andrews' personal eccentricities, this conclusion is perhaps predicated on a misinterpretation of the mid-Victorian petty bourgeois and colonial liberal context which shaped his values. As we have seen, individual socio-economic independence predicated on land possession, and a minimalist state, were the credo of the mid-Victorian liberal. This characteristic was exaggerated in the colonial context. Men who were not in possession of land did not possess the ideal complex of values implicit in such an independence, and if not so independent were not worthy or deserving of the right to vote. Thus Andrews' desire for residential qualifications.[60] Deprivation of one's independence, and particularly impediments to land ownership, were an anathema. This could account for his opposition to a land tax. Likewise, state secondary and tertiary education, and sickness pay could also be seen as excessive state intervention in the individual's domain. Andrews, therefore, could be perceived not as illiberal, but rather as ultra-liberal. This might account for his self-declared independence in the House. It would also account for the opinion that he did not consider

---

[59] *NZDB* vol II pp 7-8

[60] Smith states that in Britain, the second Reform Act of 1867 over-turned the principle established in the first such Act that property was the sole indicator of fitness to vote. This may be so, but considering the limited number of 'lodgers' (renters) enfranchised by the Bill, it was very much in principle only. Workingmen also had an insignificant role in framing the Bill, originally formulated to quiet agitation, which means that it cannot necessarily be seen as an accurate representation of their ideals. F. Smith, pp 2, 4, 234, 236.

himself a representative of labour.[61] As the glue which bound the class conciliation of the mid-Victorian consensus, liberalism was an intra-class social ideology. To overtly identify with any particular interest was unsatisfactory. If Andrews was a representative of any social group, it was not 'labour' per se but rather that portion of it constituted by the independent, self-improving, petty bourgeois, who differentiated themselves from the unskilled wage labourer. The differentiation hardened over the century as the détente between labourers and the petty bougeoise that had been implicit in the popular radicalism of the early nineteenth century faded; and 'labour' increasingly identified with new socialistic values and a new language of class, that were (at least in theory) diametrically opposed to the individualism of liberalism.[62]

Although the failure of Andrews marked the end of the direct involvement of the Working Man's Association in the 1866 election, this was not the end of the attempt to put a working man into the provincial assembly, nor the end of members' individual involvement. According to the *Lyttelton Times*, four candidates representing the working classes contested the election, in the Christchurch, Papanui, Geraldine, and Lyttelton electorates. Although the article did not, with one exception, state who the candidates were, they can be (largely) ascertained. The Christchurch candidate was Andrews; the Papanui candidate was the prominent WMA member and FLS secretary, John St. Quentin; and the Geraldine candidate, Arthur Ormsby. Who the Lyttelton candidate was is unclear.[63]

It is curious that St. Quentin did not see fit to promote his candidacy under the auspices of the Working Man's Association as Andrews did. Perhaps he was attempting to

---

[61] Roth and Hammond *Toil and Trouble* 1981 p 44

[62] This period of change manifested itself in New Zealand during the 1880s.

[63] Moore, a candidate for the Sefton electorate also stood as a 'workman' in the 1866 election. Crosby, another candidate, derided Moore's identification as a 'blue shirt' as a rhetorical device, and claimed that the rural district would be better represented by someone who identified as a farmer. He insisted that the working classes of the province had 'already expressed themselves on the subject [of working class representation], and [had] given the preference to those whose knowledge and education best fitted them for statesmen'. Moore responded that 'He was an old colonist and a hard working man, and raised himself from poverty to a position of independence; he thoroughly understood the requirements of the labouring classes, and came forward to represent them. There were plenty of 'black coats' in the council, and every class should be represented there'. *Lyttelton Times* 27 June 1866. John Jebson, an engineer and FLS member who stood in Heathcote subsequently referred to himself as a member of the 'working classes'

appeal to a broader cross-section of the electorate. In the build-up to the election, St Quentin declared that education was the greatest need, and denied rumours that he wished to banish the Bible from Canterbury schools. He was also critical of the apathy of the provincial administration over major public works, a major source of relief employment.[64] St Quentin stood against the partnership of T. S. Duncan and F. G. Stewart, who for political reasons, had together stepped down soon after their election to the provincial council, in order that they might be re-elected and appointed to the provincial executive.[65] This mechanical procedure was complicated by the candidacy of St Quentin, and council business was held up for five days.[66] In the event, St Quentin failed in his bid - and did not therefore upset the plans of Canterbury's power-brokers. However he obtained a surprizing number of votes (133), compared with the 237 for Duncan.[67] St Quentin's short political career was thereafter limited to local government.[68]

The only one of these four supposed 'working men' to gain election in 1866 was Arthur Ormsby, the Geraldine candidate. Ormsby is in many ways a curious selection for this epithet for, unlike Andrews and St Quentin, at the time of his selection he was a farmer - in Pleasant Valley, South Canterbury. Eight years later, in 1874, he was admitted as a barrister and solicitor. Also unlike Andrews and St Quentin, Ormsby was elected unopposed. The only indication of a liberal temperament was his support for Moorhouse in 1866 - although opposing his raising of loans for public works, and advocating an alteration to the price of land.[69] In 1867, Ormsby sat on the committee that looked after the interests of Temuka and districts. In 1868, he joined the Montgomery-led provincial executive, and on Montgomery's resignation in June 1869, was asked by William Rolleston to form an

---

[64] See chapter two

[65] Duncan was a lawyer, one time provincial solicitor and legal partner of J. S. Williams

[66] Hotellier George Oram, of the Lyttelton (later Clarendon) Hotel was a strident critic of St Quentin and his disruption of the smooth operation of the provincial council (LT 21 December 1866). This animosity appears to have been deep-seated, for in 1869, St Quentin suffered an unprovoked assault by Oram at the ball for the Duke of Edinburgh. Oram was convicted and fined 20s.

[67] *DNZB* vol. I, p 382-3, *MacDonald Dictionary*

[68] See below

[69] It is unclear whether Ormsby's land policy involved cheaper land for the working man, or resembled Travers waste lands policy.

executive himself. Ormsby, an advocate of the secession of South Canterbury, was unable to find sufficient support for his position amongst the council and so passed up the opportunity.[70]

The question may be asked: why did 'working men' largely fail in their bid to be elected to the provincial council in 1866 ? Andrews attributed his failure to his humble social position. The *Lyttelton Times* lamented St Quentin's failure, which it attributed to the failure of the constituency to have the same confidence in a representative of the working classes as it did 'in a candidate from the pastoral or mercantile interests'.[71] At an ostensibly superficial level therefore, failure could be attributed to the comparatively low profile and novelty of the working-men candidates, as well as habitual voting patterns, disdain from a largely antagonistic elite[72], traditional deference to social superiors, and a recognition by the electorate that working men might lack the time, resources, skills, and experience necessary to be effective representatives. There may also be another explanation that highlights the difference between early-Victorian radicalism and mid-Victorian liberalism. Under the traditional radical formulation, socio-economic independence was identified with the control of resources (including land), which in turn was believed to depend on the wresting of political power from an unsympathetic elite. In the brave new consensual world of liberalism though, the ostensibly non-partisan state ameliorated both class antagonism and the incentive for political action. It could no longer be automatically assumed by the petty bourgeoisie that a 'working man' would necessarily be a better political representative than a member of the traditional governing classes. An uneasy, transitional coexistence of liberalism with a residue of radicalism can perhaps be perceived in the 1866 election, where the petty bourgeois electorate proved divided and indecisive. Even the activist Working Man's Association, positioned at the more 'radical' end of the liberal spectrum, was politically disunited.

---

[70] *MacDonald Dictionary, Lyttelton Times* 27 June 1866
[71] ibid 14 June 1866
[72] See below, on the attitude of the *Lyttelton Times*

We have seen that the mid-Victorian era was marked particularly by its degree of class conciliation. This had resulted from an apparent convergence of values between the governed and the governors into a common culture of liberalism. One theory predicates this consensus on the middle-class fear that resulted from the popular radical upheavals of the early-nineteenth century.[73] The lack of apparent class antagonism can thus be seen to have perhaps been something of a tenuous facade, with unreconciled antagonisms still stirring beneath the surface. Scotter perceived the sometimes confrontational discourse that surrounded the candidacy of (particularly) Moorhouse and Lance during the 1866 elections as evidence of a Machiavellian attempt by Moorhouse to exploit, for political purposes, an adversarial Marxist concept of class that was not present in the provincial psyche. Scotter is correct in his assumption that such a conception of class did not exist in Christchurch at this time. He does not admit the possibility, however, that an alternative formulation of class was being deployed in the debate. If what Scotter perceives as an appeal to adversarial class is understood as a classless or anti-class discourse, (such as that between the *Lyttelton Times* and the WMA - below), it might be interpreted as a tension between differing identifications of, and commitments to, liberalism. The activist petty bourgeoisie represented by the WMA were not pushing (as Scotter sees it), for class-focused legislation as such, but for a *more* ideally liberal state against perceived obstacles of wealth and privilege.[74]

The somewhat uneasy state of the consensus can be seen in the response of the middle-class liberal daily, the *Lyttelton Times,* to the Working Man's Association. Its views of the Association alternated between conciliation and criticism depending on how 'liberal' or 'radical' the *Times* perceived the actions of the association to be. This serves to indicate a certain disjunction between bourgeois and petty bourgeois conceptions of liberalism in colonial Christchurch, and the implicit tension of the 'Whig' liberal position. The schizophrenic nature of the relationship with the *Lyttelton Times* is evident from the very beginnings of the Working Man's Association. Initially the newspaper lauded the new

---

[73] Stedman-Jones pp 190-1
[74] Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. p 149

association in liberal tones, as evidence of an increase in political participation amongst workingmen: 'A great mistake has been made for many years past', it said, 'in handing over the discussion and guidance of political interests, as contrasted with those of the colony, to a few individuals, while the mass of the community took scarcely any interest in public affairs at all'. Acknowledging the depressed circumstances which had produced the WMA, the *Times* continued: 'no class in the community can now afford to be careless, least of all those by whom the first and sharpest pressure of evils consequent on neglect is felt.' This generous welcome was, however, tempered somewhat by a thinly veiled caution, for the association to restrict its compass within certain liberal perameters that did not compromise the consensus.

> We do not imagine that the Working Men's Association means to raise up a new party, or to separate class from class. Still less do we believe that it will lend itself to any partisan movement for the gratification of those who have already entered upon a political career.

The *Times* concluded that if the association was conducted 'in an earnest and impartial spirit' and 'will go thoroughly to the root of all questions which it takes up, we will frankly accept its verdict as that of the working men of Canterbury'.[75] However, the antagonism demonstrated by the *Lyttelton Times* to political activism in the aid of what it regarded as class interest was a theme to which it was later to return with some gusto.

Once the Association was operating, the *Lyttelton Times* published an editorial praising the membership for endorsing the populist Moorhouse - whom it backed - for the superintendency. 'It is true', said the paper, 'the majority was but small, but then the minority was formed out of the junction of both the opposing parties [for Lance and Travers].' Moorhouse, it continued, was the most worthy of support because he 'has never appealed to the working man with a cry; he has never divided class against class, or done less justice to the capitalist than to the labourer'.[76] Just one month later, however, the *Lyttelton*

---

[75] *Lyttelton Times* 5 December 1865
[76] ibid 8 March 1866.

Times pronounced itself much less impressed with the activities of the Working Men's Association.

The *Times's* criticism centred on the decision of the association to put candidates for the provincial council to the same degree of scrutiny as that to which Travers, Lance, and Moorhouse had been subject, and to decide collectively their suitability. The selection of provincial council candidates (as opposed to those standing for the superintendency), said the editorial 'is far more a question of personal preference than of any deep consideration of the plans which each candidate may have arranged for his guidance should he become a member'. It warned members that for the WMA 'To stir up political partisanship within itself is to divide and weaken, not to unite the working men of the province'. The paper declared that the participation of the WMA in the election was a cause for some regret, and that they should either put forward their own candidate, or avoid reaching any conclusion on those standing.[77] It is clear that the *Lyttelton Times* was becoming uneasy about the possible influence that the WMA might have on provincial politics, and the potential it might have for engendering class division within provincial government. Consequently, it combined a reminder of the liberal focus on individual self-determination with the logically inconsistent (but equally liberal) desire for consensus, in an effort to persuade the association that its more collective and apparently radical behaviour was undesirable both for itself and the province. The suggestion by the *Times* that the association put forward its own candidate may be seen both as an expression of the liberal desire for equal representation, and a conservative attempt to confine the political influence of the Association.

The Working Man's Association seems to have taken the criticism from the *Lyttelton Times* to heart, for later that same month the candidacy of a member, Samuel Andrews, for the Christchurch seat was debated. The *Times* applauded in liberal terms (and probably with some relief) the principle of working men putting one of their 'own order' forward as a candidate:

---

[77] ibid 7 April 1866

> We believe that every class of the community should be represented in what is, comparatively, so large a body as the provincial council, and that it is particularly desirable that artisans should have an intelligent man of their own number who represents their opinions and enjoys their confidence.

The paper did have some reservations about Andrews, though. It criticized him for seeming to have 'formed an opinion that the working men can be done justice to only by his striving to upset all existing institutions, and devising new ones in their place'. In light of this apparent radicalism, it is curious that the *Times* then admitted that he was a 'sensible' and 'practical' man who would be a 'useful member' were he elected.[78]

In the event, as we have seen, only one of a number of candidates who identified as working men succeeded in being elected to the provincial council. The *Lyttelton Times* particularly lamented the fact that John St Quentin had failed to gain election, with 'his intelligent, reasonable, and moderate advocacy of measures just to all classes alike'.[79] Although, on this occasion, the paper regretted the lack of representation of the 'interest of manual labour' in the provincial council, it pulled no punches in an editorial on class in politics less than a month later. Despite reiterating the desirability of having all classes represented, this editorial again warned about the dangers of having representatives elected with only the interests of their own class at heart. 'A legislative body', said the paper 'composed of men who are avowedly the representatives of particular interests, is burdened with an unseen incubus which must destroy its general usefulness'. Such an assembly would, it cautioned, become 'an arena for the discussion of small questions in which local and individual jealousies would be appealed to'. On this basis, the paper campaigned against the attempt 'to elect members in the special interest of what is called, erroneously we think, the working classes' in the provincial electorates. 'The tendency', it continued,

> ...of such selection is radically bad, inasmuch as it goes a great way towards arraying class against class, an evil we trust, will never be allowed to show its face in this province. Hitherto we have had the good fortune to escape it, let us continue to unite in endeavouring to do so in all time to come.[80]

---

[78] ibid 2 June 1866
[79] ibid 14 June 1866
[80] ibid 2 July 1866

The opinions of the *Lyttelton Times* confirm it as a fundamentally bourgeois 'Whig' liberal periodical, reflecting the implicit tensions of this position. It favoured the political representation of all socio-economic interests as a condition of class harmony, but was nervous of the collective assertion of these interests. Consequently, when the Working Man's Association inevitably crossed the line from liberal platitudes into actions even vaguely suggestive of its radical heritage, the *Times* reacted defensively.

In the event, the concern of the *Lyttelton Times* was unwarranted. Once the political brouhaha had dissipated in the wake of the election, the issue of the representation of classes in the provincial council faded from popular consciousness. With its immediate impetus lost, the Working Man's Association began to disintegrate. In mid September 1866 it was noted that the association had not prospered of late, and that attendance was lax. In an attempt to draw a larger crowd, the WMA set aside its usual earnest didactic programme of discussion on one occasion, and a Captain Wilson gave a lecture on mesmerism.[81] But even this popular appeal could not revive the flagging fortunes of the Association, and four days later, the *Lyttelton Times* advised of what was in effect a suspension; no more meetings would take place until a resumption was announced.[82] No resumption was ever announced, however, and this notice marked the demise of the Association. A year later, an observer commented that the 'Workingman's Association was got up during an election excitement, and when that excitement was over, it fell off'.[83]

The organisation of the petty bourgeois in Christchurch does not seem to have followed any consistent pattern after the demise of the 1866 Working Men's Association. This may reflect the tendency of the petty bourgeois to unite only in times of economic stress. Although the 1866 body was not revived, in August of the following year Charles Tribe suggested at a meeting of the unemployed that the association should be reconstituted.[84] This

---

[81] ibid 15 September 1866 Probably Captain George Wilson (1820-77), superintendent of the Christchurch Fire Board and a specialist on mesmerism and galvanism. *McDonald Dictionary*

[82] *Lyttelton Times* 19 September 1866

[83] ibid 10 August 1867

[84] ibid 10 August 1867 This article originally attributed the suggestion to Frederick Caesar Tribe, secretary of the Licensed Victuallers Association in 1864, and from 1865, Christchurch City Council rate collector.

did not occur in any form until January 1871, when a meeting of the unemployed led by James Macpherson formed a Working Men's Mutual Protection Society. Like its predecessor this was a comparatively short-lived association; probably rendered obsolete by the increasing prosperity of the early 1870's.[85] An active and political Working Men's Association apparently existed at the time of the 1874 provincial election,[86] and in 1881 a Working Men's Political Association was formed in Christchurch with the object of placing a representative of labour in the General Assembly .[87] In 1884 a meeting was held at the Knightstown Library (attached to the St Albans Mutual Improvement Association) to form a branch of this Association. This had the aim of acquainting workmen with the laws of the colony - especially those relating to taxation and land, and to make them more politically aware. At the next election of the St Albans Borough Council, three candidates were nominees of the Association.[88] It can be seen, therefore, that the liberal ideas expressed in 1866 were still strongly characteristic of workmen nearly twenty years later.

So far the chapter has considered the involvement of members of the Working Man's Association in provincial politics. However, three members of the WMA's apolitical off-shoot, the Canterbury Freehold Land Society, were also involved in provincial politics. These men, John Jebson, William Wilson, and Francis Garrick all stood at the 1866 election, and Wilson and Garrick were elected as the two councillors for Christchurch City. None of the three apparently stood as workmen, but Jebson, who was defeated in the Heathcote seat subsequently announced that he would not stand again whilst what he termed 'the present

---

McDonald Dictionary A letter from F. C. Tribe subsequently attributed the suggestion to Charles Tribe.

[85] The scope of this group was apparently narrower than that of the 1865-66 body, as Roth and Hammond believe that its main object was the warning of prospective immigrants about New Zealand's depressed labour market. *Toil and Trouble* 1981 p 18. Also see chapter two.

[86] J. Hayes, 'The Nature of the Canterbury Provincial Council Elections of 1866 and 1874' History 630 essay; University of Canterbury, 1995 (unpub.) p 17.

[87] Salmond, p 125.

[88] *St Albans; From Swamp to Suburbs- An Informal History* New Zealand Federation of University Women Canterbury Branch 1989. p 77. The St Albans-Knightstown area, to the north of Christchurch, had something of a reputation for its political activity. It was centre of Methodism, had a strong mutual improvement association from the 1860s, and was the home of a number of Working Man's Association members (see chapter 5). In later years St Albans was a Liberal Party stronghold, supporting W. P. Reeves - whose father had been a trustee of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society, and who, as proprieter of the *Lyttelton Times,* may have been the writer who coaxed and scolded the Working Man's Association in 1865-66.

system of class feeling' prevailed. It was, he said, hopeless for any member of the working classes to stand for the provincial council. In 1874, however, he was successful in his bid for a seat. William Wilson was first elected to the provincial council for Kaiapoi in 1864, and represented Christchurch from 1866-70. In 1867 he was a member of the provincial council committee on unemployment.[89] Wilson also played a prominent role in municipal government in Christchurch.

Local or municipal government was important to the petty bourgeoisie because it provided an accessible means to a limited degree of political self determination. Consequently, members of both the Working Man's Association and the Freehold Land Society were more extensively involved, on an personal basis, with municipal rather than provincial government.

Before 1862, the provincial government administered both town and country in Canterbury. In that year, Christchurch was gazetted a municipal district, which entitled residents to elect a municipal council. The following year (1863) saw a Roads District Ordinance passed, placing residents of the suburbs under the control of various roads boards. The suburbs were thus separated administratively from Christchurch. In 1868 Christchurch was gazetted a borough, and later that year formally adopted the title of City.[90]

Thirteen identified members of either the Canterbury Working Man's Association or the Canterbury Freehold Land Society stood for election to the Christchurch City Council in its various guises between 1862 and the 1890's. Of this number, ten were successful, of whom three served as mayor. FLS members William Wilson, John Barrett, and member and trustee Henry Alport were all members of the first municipal council in 1862. Wilson became first mayor of the newly constituted city in 1868, but irreparably damaged his political career through some underhand business dealings in 1869 and 1876.[91] When he was re-elected to the council in the late 1870s, five councillors resigned in protest. Alport served on the

---

[89] See chapter two.
[90] Morrison pp 105-109.
[91] See chapter two.

council for a number of years, and was considered the most prominent member in 1865. John St Quentin (FLS, WMA) and William Barnes (WMA) stood unsuccessfully for the council in 1868. St Quentin just missed election on this occasion, so stood again the following year, when unfortunately he failed once more. Aaron Ayers (FLS) failed in 1870 and 1877, finally sitting for the S.E. ward in 1878. Ayers also stood for mayor in 1880 and 1883, and was rewarded for his persistence in 1885.

A number of members began their political careers in the city council after the sample period of the late 1860s - mainly in the following decade. John Caygill (FLS) stood twice, failing on both occasions.[92] Particularly prominent was James Gapes (WMA). He stood successfully for the council in 1873, when he was elected unopposed; in 1874, when he came top of the poll, and in 1878. He served as mayor in 1876-77, and 1880 when he beat Aaron Ayers. William Vincent and Robert England (FLS) both stood successfully in 1879, and Vincent again in 1880. E. V. Hiorns (FLS) was elected to the S.W. ward in 1881: Samuel Andrews (WMA), in the twilight of his political career, stood successfully for the council from 1884-87. Finally in 1894, almost twenty-five years after the Freehold Land Society was wound up, William Samuels (FLS) was elected as the tail end of this generation of politicized petty bourgeoisie.[93]

Not all members of the Freehold Land Society and the Working Man's Association dwelt within the bounds of Christchurch City, and a number therefore contributed to other local authorities. John Jebson (FLS) left Christchurch in the late 1860s to live in the Malvern district. In 1870 he was elected to the local roads board, but proved so objectionable that the other members resigned en masse. Elijah Gadd (FLS) stood for the Heathcote Roads Board

---

[92] Caygill's dates are unknown.

[93] Three men who were not members of the WMA or the FLS, but who were involved with the agitations of 1867, 1868, or 1870, and who stood for the Council were Michael Hart, Hugh Bennetts, and R. Binstead. Hart, a leader of the 1867 unemployment agitation, failed in his first attempt to be elected to the Council in 1869, but was successful later that same year. In 1873 he gave a magnificent banquet to celebrate his accession to the mayoralty, but was not re-elected in 1875. This may have been because he was 'often noisy and truculent'- usually because he was drunk. Hart stood for the council again in 1875-76, but was not re-elected. Bennetts failed to gain election in 1870, but was successful fourteen years later in 1884. Binstead stood for the Council twice, and was successful on his second attempt in 1878.

twice, in 1867 and 1871, but failed on both occasions. John Cutler (FLS & WMA) was elected a member of the Avon Roads Board, but apparently resigned after a disagreement with the provincial council over funding. Thomas Mutton (in 1868), J. Wilkin (in 1867), and J. S. Wilcox, all of the FLS, were members of the Lyttelton Municipal Council. Wilcox served on the first Lyttelton Council in 1862, and thereafter in 1865, 1869, and 1876. He was mayor of the authority in 1869. It can be seen, therefore, that participation in municipal government was regarded highly by the sample members of the Christchurch petty bourgeoisie.[94]

Conclusion

The British liberal political culture grew out of a heritage of radicalism, with its experience of state-sanctioned domination, exclusion, and repression. Liberal politics were thus based on a belief in individual independence, and a desire to access political power in order to implement this belief. Liberalism differed from radicalism in several important respects, however. Firstly, it was a organic formulation. Achievement of independence would automatically secure a moral society. Secondly, liberalism projected an image of the state, where the state was not partisan but a neutral social regulator, and the most appropriate means of securing independence. Political power was therefore to be obtained by reformist, not revolutionary means. Class struggle was consequently minimal, and consensus emphasized.

Colonial society theoretically offered the ideal environment for achieving one's independence. Popular politics in New Zealand were strongly liberal. Without a significant conservative social rump to combat, liberal politics in the colony turned from what was an opposing role to one of constructing a new liberal social reality on a blank canvas. This was not as straight forward as it might seem because of the troublesome nature of liberalism.

---

[94] Two men who were not members of the WMA or the FLS, but were involved with the unemployment agitations, and stood for local government outside Christchurch were Thomas Cooper and Matthew Hall. Cooper was elected to the Avon Roads Board in 1867 after an abortive attempt at the city council. Matthew Hall, a leader of the unemployed in Kaiapoi in 1864, was a prominent member of the Kaiapoi Municipal Council in 1867, and was elected first mayor of the new borough in 1868.

Liberalism was a problematic ideology because it prescribed an outcome without a method. This allowed for the existence of a wide variety of strategies and interpretations within the wider discourse. The pattern was further complicated by the partial survival (or perception of the survival) of more confrontational, archaic modes of social thought, such as radicalism and conservatism. Within the liberal discourse, two modes of liberalism predominated: the 'Whig' or elite, held by the bourgeois; and the popular, held by the petty bourgeois. There was a certain tension between them. This was expressed in Christchurch by the discord between the Canterbury Working Man's Association and the *Lyttelton Times*.

The petty bourgeois WMA was ostensibly a liberal institution intended to integrate members into the political process. In making political choices, it supported liberalizing measures, consistently resisting infringements of the individual's right to self determination. But in seeking a greater degree of individual freedom, the WMA met an unpassable structural difficulty. This was the fact that the official perameters of the social discourse were set ultimately by Whig liberals, who placed a more conservative interpretation on liberalism. The popular liberalism represented by the WMA could not effectively challenge these boundaries because liberal principles determined that all failings were a function of the individual, not the system. There was no recognized political discourse through which systemic grievances could be articulated. The WMA, therefore, could not demand a more liberal polity without risking exceeding the acceptable bounds of the social consensus, and opening itself to accusations of illiberalism. Consequently, a certain unreconcilable social tension can be perceived beneath the liberal platitudes. The Whig liberal *Lyttelton Times* chose to interpret this in terms of the survival of 'radical' class antagonism rather than as an outcome of the liberal discourse. This was, in part, probably because the popular radical past was still a recent memory. The extent of these ideological links to a radical past, however, is tenuous. It is more likely they are a dislocated rhetorical remnant, amplified by the paranoia of an insecure bourgeoisie, than an alternative social discourse. Nonetheless, the contemporary

rhetoric serves to illustrate the sometimes uneasy nature of the seamless new liberal consensus in the colony.

The lack of clear liberal prescription also engendered division within each of these two liberal modes over what exactly constituted a liberal intervention. Within the 'Whig' mode, this was expressed by the divergent development strategies of Superintendents Moorhouse and Rolleston, where Rolleston promoted a regulatory means of achieving a level playing field, and Moorhouse, a developmental scheme. In the 'Popular' mode this was expressed by the division between Barnes and Andrews. This debate on the meaning of liberal intervention ultimately divided the petty bourgeois at the ballot box.

This political divisiveness, and the small membership and short life of the WMA raises questions about its representativeness, and about the coherence of the Christchurch petty bourgeoisie as a class. The ideological positions of the association and its members were probably more extreme than those in the community at large. The muffling action of liberalism on the identification of independent class interest determined this. The outspokeness of the WMA does not necessarily mean, though, that its opinions were unrepresentative. The prominent positions in the wider community occupied by many members would appear to indicate broad support for their actions (see chapter five).

CHAPTER 4: LAND

This chapter examines the significance of land for the mid-Victorian petty bourgeoisie, comparing the attitudes of the old world with those of the Christchurch sample. The radical and liberal association of landed property with the complex of values implicit in an 'independence', elevated land ownership to a central position in the mid-Victorian psyche. The socio-economic circumstances of the petty bourgeoisie gave the ideology a particular relevancy for them. Colonialism also accentuated the central place of landed property. This chapter looks particularly at the role of land in the debates of the petty bourgeois Canterbury Working Man's Association, and the ideology and practise of its subsidiary, the Canterbury Freehold Land Society.

As we have seen in chapter three, the basic ethos of mid-Victorian British liberalism was a belief in a laissez-faire world of individual and community self government. This was inspired by, and expressed in terms of a nostalgic idealization of peasant proprietorship. This 'pastoral dream', where one owned one's land, had no landlord, and was orderly and prosperous, held such attraction because of the social values that this lifestyle was believed to engender. In particular, this included a state of individual moral virtue that collectively equated to a broad civic virtue; and by inference, a certain relationship between the state and society where society was pre-eminent. The widely-held perception was, however, that this ideal social formulation had broken down in the face of the engrossment of land in the hands of a few. This was held to be the ultimate determinant of the condition of the 'working classes', who had been driven to the cities where they were subject to the ills of unemployment and overcrowding.[1] This social typology was closely derived from the traditions of English radicalism.

---

[1] Biagini *Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform* 1992. pp 86-91, 186. For a definition of these 'ruralist' principles in a New Zealand context, see T. Brooking 'Use it or Loose it: Unravelling the Land Debate in Late Nineteenth Century New Zealand' *The New Zealand Journal of History* vol. 30 no. 2 (1996). pp 141-160. Although covering a later period, Brooking distinguishes many of the same attitudes to land that emerge in this chapter.

This desire for an 'independence' predicated on peasant proprietorship created a fundamental paradox in the governance of mid-Victorian British society. On the one hand, the desired and indeed logical corollary of individual independence was a laissez-faire state. Conversely, the association of independence with land brought demands for a degree of state intervention. As the social ideal for working men was petty proprietorship, so their ideal society was one of small, landed producers. Land, though, was different from other forms of property in that it was a limited commodity. Land monopoly was therefore regarded as a particular danger to the achievement of the ideal values of an independence. This view was augmented by another old radical conviction - still held firmly by the petty bourgeoisie - of the natural right of property: that labour was the only legitimate source of property rights, all other wealth being an artificial derivative. Both these views contributed to an antipathy towards landlordism and 'unearned increment' - and a demand for governmental intervention to control them. Mid-Victorian British liberal values therefore promoted an ideal social system that was simultaneously both state-regulated and laissez-faire. The apparently contradictory tendencies that this manifests were reconciled, however, by a general consensus as to the absolute limits of government interference. Active intervention was necessary for the creation of an sustainable laissez-faire system, but once this ideal was accomplished, government could effectively cease to exist.

As the problems of a changing British society were perceived to be the result of estrangement from the pastoral idyll and its values, so the solutions to these problems had their inspiration in the idealization of land. Land rights had thus been a clarion call of radicals since before Chartism. The major scourge of Victorian England was unemployment (or rather under-employment).[2] One short-term strategy for its resolution was the creation of extra ordinary public works, but the definitive answer was perceived to be in the countryside, through redistributive land reform. This inspired various forms of home colonization and

---

[2] See chapter two

emigration.[3] Land schemes were central to the Chartist social programme, with debate on the respective values of individual or communitarian land-holding.[4]

For the British petty bourgeoisie, therefore, the possession of small-scale real property (such as land and buildings) was a defining characteristic, and yielded a strong attraction. It represented their social and economic independence, embodied their moral values, and served to differentiate them from the labouring masses.[5] In relation to their property, the petty bourgeoisie often occupied both entrepreneurial and proprietorial roles, as both landlords and developers. In the towns they were major providers of working-class housing.[6] For the rural petty bourgeoisie, property was important because of the extent of pluri-activity, where the income from trade was augmented by the cultivation of a small holding. This duality was weakening in England at mid-century, but was still a common rural social feature.[7]

Access to land in New Zealand of the 1860's was an issue which assumed tremendous significance for most settlers because of the ideology of property ownership which they had bought with them from Britain. Fairburn (and others) have argued that the primary goal of most working men, and thus a central factor in determining their choice of destination when emigrating, was the capacity to achieve a 'competency' or 'independence' in their new home. The possibility of attaining better material conditions had a significant role to play in determining perceptions, but the central attraction was undoubtedly the ability to secure an economic 'independence' centred upon the ownership of landed property. 'Workingmen did not come out here merely to get a living. They could do that at home.' declared 'Workman' in 1867, 'Their aim and object in coming out here was to secure in a few

---

[3] Biagini *Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform* 1992 pp 184-188
[4] Stedman-Jones pp 153 -157
[5] Crossick and Haupt pp 201-203
[6] ibid p 123
[7] ibid p 57

years by frugality and industry a small independence'.[8] Indeed, Brooking regards land as the definitive issue of colonial life.[9]

The yeomanry ideal was invested with particular significance in the colonial context because it and the values it embodied were easily attainable. This ideal held particular appeal because it offered not only relief from want, but also freedom from the subservience and obligation of the dependent paternalistic relations of the old country.[10] Writes Olssen, 'The idea had subsistence overtones ... but it also reflected a belief that manhood could only be guaranteed by economic independence'.[11] The ownership of freehold property meant that a workingman was not solely dependent upon the market for his material well-being. The additional income or subsistence production that the land potentially provided could act to insulate the owner during periods of under or unemployment, and allow them the capacity to withdraw temporarily from the market in search of better employment. Though most settlers did not own enough property to make them entirely economically independent, Fairburn considers that ownership was sufficiently widespread to render the New Zealand worker a 'masterless' man.[12] Working from the 1882 *Return of Freeholders,* he estimates that as many as fifty percent of all men in the colony owned land at this time; and that this figure included between 34% and 46% of manual workers. Thomson considers this latter estimate conservative, for many men were not yet in the property acquiring phase of life. Amongst the 'settled' or 'heads of household', the figure might have topped 50%.[13]

The attainment of an 'independence' in the colony was understood by settlers, in its ideal form, as a gradual progression from landless wage labourer to independent property owner through the accretion of 'market advantages'. Fairburn acknowledges that there were a variety of strategies for 'getting on', but considers that of these, what he terms the 'rural apprenticeship' was held to be the ideal. This was special, says Fairburn, because it was

---

[8] *Lyttelton Times* 24 July 1867.
[9] Brooking p 143
[10] M. Fairburn *The Ideal Society and its Enemies* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1989. p 44
[11] Olssen p 165.
[12] Fairburn, p 103.
[13] D. Thomson 'Colonial Thrift' *History Now* vol. III, no.1, 1997. p 12

believed to guarantee the elevation of 'the most humble, that it operated more rapidly than other devices, and that it was open to everyone'.[14] Towns were considered to be an impediment to mobility because of the congested urban labour market; and an artificial economy, where a tendency to extreme fluctuation and high land values made land ownership relatively less accessible.[15] Under the rural apprenticeship, a (usually) newly arrived workman would shift into the countryside, where he would work at a variety of rural jobs whilst gaining the 'market advantages' of experience and capital. Eventually he would purchase his own plot of land, after which he would gradually spend less time working for a wage, as his own land came into production. This, Fairburn considers to be 'a self perpetuating mechanism of social improvement' that could theoretically elevate every successive cohort of immigrant labour.[16] The system corresponds to the radical notion of labour being the only valid means of acquiring property. Its apparent success was depicted in sanguine terms by Christopher Holloway when he visited the Ashburton district in 1874;

> On the morrow...I called upon Mr Church, a small farmer.... He was formerly a carman in London, but not succeeding so well in life as he could wish, he emigrated to New Zealand a few years ago. On his arrival in the colony, he did as every man should do who wishes to make his way out here, that is, pitched into the first employment that presented its-self, determined in the first place, to get a knowledge of colonial life, and work his way upwards, if possible. And what has been the result ? Why this - when I visited him today, he was owner and occupier of a very fine fertile farm, well fenced and watered, of 200 acres of land, and has succeeded in placing himself in very easy and comfortable circumstances.[17]

What was pivotal to the acceptance of the concept of 'an independence on the land' as a socio-economic goal was its achieveability, through the means of individual occupational (and therefore social) mobility. If this mobility was imperilled in any way, then the ideological glue which helped to bind colonial society would come unstuck. Hence, the

---

[14] Fairburn pp 57-8

[15] ibid, p 55.

[16] ibid, pp 57-58. Arnold depicts a similar progression, but adds an extra detail in the form of a move inland to undeveloped country as a way of obtaining a reasonable freehold on limited means. See R. Arnold *The Farthest Promised Land: English Villagers, New Zealand Immigrants of the 1870s* Wellington: Victoria University Press with Price Milburn, 1981. p 282

[17] ibid p 83. Christopher Holloway was at that time the chairman of the Oxford District of the National Union, an English rural labourers' union. Later he was appointed to the staff of New Zealand's Agent General, Featherstone, as an emigration agent.

necessity of maintaining the perception of an equality of opportunity - the belief that there were no barriers or comparative advantages such as education, class, or wealth necessary to the attainment of a competency: the 'labourers paradise'. Natural abundance, it was believed, 'had largely abolished the necessity for associational props'. All that was required was the internalization of the values of self discipline and the work ethic.[18] A eulogistic William Swainson outlined this belief in 1859:

> But for the stout agricultural labourer, for the industrious artisan, the domestic servant, the small hard working farmer with a thrifty wife and stalwart sons and daughters - for every class of our countrymen who able and willing to earn their daily bread by means of their daily labour, the country offers a congenial field of which an early independence may with certainty be earned.[19]

Arnold sums up the expectation of the new immigrant. In this case he is alluding particularly to the ideals of the immigrant farm labourer; but this is equally applicable to the complex of values held by the petty bourgeois settler:

> The immigrant rural labourer was impelled by his memories of the world he had left, and by the opportunities of the colonial world he had joined, towards one paramount personal ambition and one dominant social ideal. He would till his land as an independent yeoman farmer, and he would live in a yeoman community where men mixed in a brotherhood of rough equality. His wife and children would toil with him, helping to bring his dream to pass, and sharing in its fruits. There would be no degraded paupers to shame his community, and no great ones exacting deference whilst living in idle luxury. Rather in this yeoman's Promised Land, all would enjoy security against the fear of want, a daily round enriched by family fellowship, and leisure to share, according to their interests and abilities, in the affairs and recreations of the local community.[20]

This rose-tinted concept of independence was a hegemonic social creed that infused and defined the petty bourgeois community to perhaps a greater degree than any other social group. Yet it appears that many petty bourgeois immigrants fully intended to remain in their trade, occupation, and class. Chapter two, for example, shows that few members of either the WMA or the FLS actually adopted the yeoman lifestyle in its entirety - even when capable of doing so. The key point is that independence was central to the petty bourgeoisie because they were already (at least theoretically) economically independent. They had, therefore, no

---

[18] Fairburn, p 51.
[19] W. Swainson, *New Zealand and its Colonization.* 1859. p. 194.
[20] Arnold p 260

pressing need to become domiciled in some rural idyll. More important was the bolstering of their existing socio-economic situation. The principles of peasant proprietorship were thus translated to fit the urban context, with little (if any) expectation that they would actually lay down their tools or apron to become full-time farmers. For these men, the ownership of small parcels of urban land was the practical reality of landed independence.[21]

The significance apportioned to land by some of the petty bourgeoisie of Christchurch can be seen in the discussion of the Working Man's Association, and in the workings of its offshoot, the Freehold Land Society. The issue of land emerged as the pre-eminent concern of the Working Man's Association, particularly during the examination of candidates James D. Lance and William T. L. Travers for the provincial superintendency. Opinion amongst WMA members as to the merits of each of these men and their platforms was not unanimous, but two land-related liberal values are distinguishable: the desire to be free of 'aristocratic' domination, and the desire for ready access to land.[22]

A disdain for the forelock touching subjugation implicit in 'aristocratic' type patronage motivated the majority of members to strongly oppose the candidacy of pastoralist James Lance.[23] His privileged position and paternalistic attitude infuriated the petty bourgeois Working Man's Association, with their great concern for independence and equality of opportunity. Particularly galling was his attitude to land tenure.

At the meeting of the Working Man's Association convened in February 1866 to consider Lance's claims for the superintendency, the majority of members were vigorous in their opposition to the pastoralist. Two brave apologists emphasized Lance's gentlemanly character. Charles Worth applauded Lance for apparently helping men onto the land by permitting them to settle informally on his run, and then allowing them to pay these

---

[21] Fairburn distinguishes one exception to widespread desire for independence on the land. This was the ideal of the waged manual worker, who did not aspire to complete material independence, but an attenuated version in the form of home ownership. Fairburn does not include those who operated their own enterprizes in this catagory, but it does indicate the degree to which the value of independence had penetrated society. p 43

[22] For a listing of WMA members' land holdings, see appendix 1, fig. 3

[23] Lance was the owner of Horsley Down station at Hawarden in North Canterbury, on the margins of the Waikari Plain, where the Canterbury Freehold Land Society made a large purchase in 1866.

acquisitions off as and when they were able. Lance, he continued, had also been seen to provide extra employment to assist these payments.

This overt paternalism did not appeal to most Association members, however, who castigated Lance for his patronizing attitude to the 'working classes'. Antipathy was expressed particularly towards the quasi-feudal tenure that Lance was perceived to be encouraging on his lands. James Gapes considered that a 'mechanic' who entered such a contract

> would be in a far worse position than if he had bought the land himself, even though he had paid the government ready cash for it. He would be at the mercy of the squatter, who would have the power to turn him off if he pleased. If the man did not conform himself to the squatter's wishes, he would no doubt be turned off, and often at great sacrifice to him.

Josiah Hadley expressed a similar opinion, believing that a man in this position would be like 'a monkey with a chain around his middle' who, if he acted independently, 'would be driven or pulled backwards or forwards until he gave in'. Despite Worths' opposition, an amended resolution declaring the election of Lance prejudical to the province was carried by the great majority of those present.[24]

It can be seen from this debate that Association members were concerned to have an appropriate and accessible means of acquiring land that did not compromise their vaunted independence. Association expressions on this issue of accessibility centred on another candidate for the superintendency, William Travers, and his proposals to reform Canterbury's land system. A lawyer and former soldier, Travers had represented Nelson and Waimea in the General Assembly during the 1850's. Shifting to Christchurch during the mid 1860s, he resumed his political career as a candidate in the election for provincial superintendent in 1866.[25] Travers stood on a platform of land reform, proposing a two-pronged attack on Canterbury's land regulations. The first and easily most controversial part of this was his waste lands scheme which proposed to tamper with that most revered linchpin

---

[24] *Lyttelton Times* 1 March, 1866. See chapter 3 for a biographical sketch of Lance.
[25] See chapter 3, footnote 38 for a biographical sketch of Travers.

of Canterbury Province's waste land policy, the 'sufficient price'.[26] The second dealt with reforming the abuse by pastoralists of the 'pre-emptive right' of purchase.

Land access in Canterbury was governed by the idea of the 'sufficient price'. Promulgated by the Canterbury Association, this concept was intended to set the appropriate socio-economic tone for the Canterbury settlement. The comparatively high price of £3 an acre would prevent workmen from moving on to the land too quickly, and therefore allow for a plentiful supply of farm labour, whilst at the same time making purchase unattractive to pastoralists and speculators, and thereby preventing land aggregation. The Canterbury settlement so envisaged was one of a close-knit matrix of traditionally managed arable farms. The income from land sales would provide for infrastructural development and immigration. Leasehold pastoralism was eventually permitted by Godley, but only as a 'temporary' measure until the land was needed for arable farming. The expectation was that runs would be rolled back in the face of an inexorable tide of cultivation. The Canterbury Provincial Council adopted these regulations on its inception, but reduced the upset price to £2 an acre.[27]

The enthusiasm of Canterbury province for this mechanistic social construct bordered on the fanatical. Its leaders and their newspapers seemed convinced that their regulations were of the most perfect kind, and no dissent would be heard.[28] Practical application of the regulations, however, revealed significant flaws. The high sufficient price was intended to encourage close settlement and discourage land aggregation, but it also had two unplanned and negative consequences. The first and most fundamental was that, whether the price was high or low, the advantage was still with large capitalists; the higher the price, the more likely that they would be the only purchaser. The high price thus tended

---

[26] 'Waste' land was the term used to refer to unoccupied crown land.

[27] Brooking regards Godley as promoting a rigid hierarchy that was the antithesis of the equalitarian yeoman ideal. (p 149) The yeoman ideal did not itself preclude the development of hierarchy, although the yeoman's hierarchy was meritocratic to a greater degree.

[28] Hensley pp 31, 45. *The Lyttelton Times* wrote in glowing prose on many occasions of Canterbury's 'excellent land regulations' and how these would prevent pastoralism from interfering with the 'ultimate settlement' of the province. Southland province was apparently so impressed with Canterbury's confidence in its land regulations that it considered implementing them itself - though without, admonished the *Times*, actually understanding the concepts involved. (13 October 1864)

to work against the small purchaser; and the provincial government's failure to implement term payments accentuated this problem. Many working men felt the price was too high, and were forced into the willing arms of land agents whose terms they were compelled to meet.[29] The Canterbury Freehold Land Society was probably a mechanism intended to overcome these hurdles (see below). The price for marginal pastoral land being the same as good arable land meant, however, that pastoralists preferred the more agreeable terms of leasehold rather than purchase. The depressed economic situation in the late 1860s aggravated these tendencies, and land sales shrank. The resultant dwindling of the land fund was of great concern to the provincial government, as this was the principal means of financing infrastructural development, and providing relief employment.

Travers 'waste lands scheme', the first part of his land reform programme, was designed to address the problem of the dwindling land fund by tampering with the sufficient price. The proposal was that Canterbury's lands be formally classified as either agricultural or pastoral, and that the pastoral lands be sold at a pound an acre. This, Travers considered, would enable a large quantity of pastoral land to be sold in a short period, the income from which would provide for the development of the provincial infrastructure - to the point at which agricultural land could readily be sold at £3 an acre. Canterbury's land would therefore realize the same total sum as it would were it all sold at the original upset government price of £2 per acre; but it would, in addition, bring an immediate income to the cash-strapped provincial government, and expedite the settlement of the province.

Travers presented his scheme to the Working Man's Association in June 1866. Support for the plan was mixed. Given that members were solidly urban petty bourgeoisie, they had no direct personal interest in the price of agricultural land. The association of land ownership and the economic and social well-being implicit in such an independence ensured however that even urban working men took an active interest in the topic. It is obvious that some members had no aspirations to rural land ownership. If they had had even the slightest

---

[29] Such as R. J. S. Harman, a trustee of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society. See Hensley p 46-7, and Scotter 'Canterbury, 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. p 207, 219.

interest in the purchase of rural land for investment or settlement, members should have opposed the plan, as it made rural land more expensive. However, three Association members - Campbell, Mansell, and Samuel Andrews - favoured Travers' initiative. Mansell considered that 'The land regulations might be very good but there was no reason why they should be like the laws of the Medes and Persians - unchangeable'. As he perceived it, there was a vast amount of pastoral land lying idle for want of a purchaser at £2, and thus it was 'surely more advisable' that the province receive a reduced price for it rather than not sell it at all. Smith, Lee, Mills, St Quentin, Worth, and Dr Florance all opposed Travers scheme. St Quentin, in particular, was 'strongly opposed' as he felt it would only benefit the 'squattocracy'. He also questioned where the purchasers would come from. Worth believed it would compel squatters to purchase, and thus alienate land from the ownership of small farmers. Smith objected to the lowering of the price of pastoral land, but more particularly to the immigration that Travers promised that this scheme would bring about.[30] In the face of wide-spread provincial opposition to his scheme, Travers let go of the idea, and it gradually faded from view over the course of his campaign. In its place, he emphasized his desire to reform the abuses of the 'pre-emptive right of purchase'.

The pre-emptive right of purchase was another corollary of the 'sufficient price'. The ideal of the pre-eminence of the arable farmer implicit in the sufficient price dictated that pastoral land be sold at the same price as good quality farmland. This economic imperative meant that pastoralists held the majority of their lands under leasehold rather than freehold tenure. This was immediately financially beneficial to runholders, but all leasehold lands administered under the sufficient price scheme were potentially open to application for purchase, and therefore ultimately insecure. Having in many cases made significant investments in their properties, runholders strove to gain a greater degree of security to leasehold. Land regulations were thus framed by the pastoralist-dominated Provincial Council to allow runholders greater latitude in consolidating and extending their holdings.

---

[30] *Lyttelton Times* 14 February, 1866. See chapter 2 on immigration concerns.

During his first period in office, for example, Moorhouse negotiated to extend substantially the leases of the runs in return for an increased rent. What really enshrined the hegemony of the pastoralists, however, was the mechanism known as the 'pre-emptive right'. This allowed the runholder first right of refusal on applications made for certain integral parts of his estate. Initiated under the Canterbury Association, the idea was modified and augmented under the Waste Land Regulations of 1856 to allow the runholder first option on 250 acres around his homestead, and 50 acres around the sites of major improvements such as outstations and fencing.[31] After 1862, the area granted annually for pre-emptive rights rose sharply. This rankled with many citizens because of the abuses perpetrated under the system. Runholders could often register pre-emptive rights on the flimsiest of improvements, and then when a selection was made by an aspiring farmer, stymie it by purchasing the choicest twenty acre section of a block.[32] This shutting off of land from free selection, in conjunction with the high price, caused considerable (and increasing) frustration to intending purchasers during the straitened economic conditions of the latter 1860's.

Consequently, when Travers proclaimed as part of his platform the desire to reform the pre-emptive right, it captured the public imagination. Reforming the pre-emptive right became something of a focus for general discontent, for under the liberal view of land, aggregation was perceived as the root of all social problems, and freer distribution to be the solution. By the end of the provincial elections in 1866, there was hardly a candidate who was not promising to reform the pre-emptive right.

The Working Man's Association discussed the issue of the pre-emptive right at the end of their February 1866 meeting, and then more comprehensively a month later.[33] By the time the March meeting was convened members were convinced of the need to change the land laws to circumscribe the abuse. However, a number accidentally conflated Travers' waste lands scheme with his plan for righting the abuses of the pre-emptive right. On the

---

[31] Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. pp 49-51

[32] ibid pp 190, 194-195. In 1861, the provincial council increased from £20 to £50 the value of improvements necessary to secure a pre-emptive right.

[33] *Lyttelton Times* 14 February 1866, 21 March 1866

basis of what was actually a radical prescription for the former, they mistakenly opposed the resolution of the latter. This was primarily Travers' fault, for though his demagoguery had brought the issue of the pre-emptive right to public attention, he had not actually prescribed the details of a solution. The majority of speakers concerned themselves with issues of land access and aggregation. At the February meeting, St Quentin had admitted the necessity of change, but opposed the abolition of the pre-emptive right on the basis that squatters were entitled to some compensation if they had made significant improvements. At the March meeting he lamented the thousands of acres that the pre-emptive right kept from cultivation. Dr Florance warned that New Zealand's land laws 'gave too much favour to speculators and land sharks. The great thing they had to fear was the land monopoly system.' Commander remarked 'on the benefit that would accrue to the community if greater facilities were given to the poorer classes to obtain land for cultivation'. Samuel Andrews examined some of the political implications of the issue, asserting that the provincial council had no will to change the status quo. He added that although many provincial councillors had promised to look into the matter of the pre-emptive right, they had yet to do so. Andrews then cast his lot with Travers, requesting that the meeting consider those among the candidates who had been responsible for the inequalities of the present system, and those who had been responsible for bringing the 'evil' to their attention.[34] The meeting subsequently passed a motion withdrawing Association support from those candidates who did not support a change to the land laws.

In the event, Travers finished a distant third behind Moorhouse and Lance in the contest for the superintendency. His profile was such, however, that he was elected to the provincial council the following year for the significantly petty bourgeois electorate of Christchurch City. Once there however, he appeared to show little interest in the land reform juggernaut he had released. The issue of pre-emptive right abuses had picked up such

[34] Implying respectively Moorhouse and Travers.

momentum, however, that politicians ignored it at their peril. The feeling of many Canterbury constituents was that some form of resolution was required.

During the 1866 session of the Provincial Council, the issue was considered by a select committee dominated by pastoralists. Their conservative recommendations for reform were introduced to the full council, where they were strengthened and augmented considerably.[35] The draft bill confirmed existing pre-emptive rights, but prohibited the granting of further improvement rights. It forbade the cultivation of more land than was necessary for stock feed, and made it obligatory for the runholder to purchase the whole of an area when it was challenged. The Canterbury Waste Lands Act was submitted to the General Assembly for approval in 1867, and was passed in its entirety. Squatters, however, were a stronger presence in the Assembly than they were in the Canterbury Provincial Council; and John Hall, who introduced the bill to parliament, was able to add a clause whereby pastoralists were to be paid full compensation for the value of improvements on land purchased by others. Although the bill was a major break-through, Scotter suggests that it left much to be desired, for the power of the pastoralists was constrained but not broken.[36] This had to wait for another day. Considering the liberal ethos then prevalent in the community however, it is unlikely that many constituents wished to break the power of the pastoralists in its entirety. The desire was for equality of opportunity, and equitable access to an independence. Actual economic and social inequality was accepted, and was not in itself of great concern. People did not object per se to the runholders' control of affairs; the undercurrent of antagonism and discontent existed primarily over the abuse of land regulations. Constraint was to be preferred to abolition.

The mid Victorian colonial petty bourgeoisie were, thus, not opposed to government action to aid the acquisition of an independence on the land. In the same fashion, the members of this class were not opposed to acting in concert, if it would ultimately strengthen their independence. Independence was an individuated ideal, though, and collective action

---

[35] Pitcaithly p 104
[36] Scotter 'Canterbury 1857-68' *A History of Canterbury* 1971. p 195

was in theory a temporary expedient. The desire for an independence on the land gained concrete expression in two consecutive nineteenth-century organisations, the co-operative land movement, and the freehold land society. In their particular aims, each demonstrates a similar conception of the values associated with land, but different approaches to the achievement of the ideal. Thus they reflect the differing social ethos that prevailed at the time of their respective inceptions, and the shift in social values around the middle of the nineteenth century. The early nineteenth century 'radical' co-operative land movement emphasized the collective pursuit and the *collective* achievement of the ideal; the later 'liberal' freehold land society that in many ways grew from the co-operative movement emphasized the collective pursuit of an *individualized* achievement of the ideal.

The early co-operative movement differed from its later manifestation in that its end was not co-operative retailing, but rather the creation of co-operative communities. Founded under the utopian socialist ideals of Robert Owen, the early societies functioned as trading or producer co-operatives. Their ultimate objective, however, was to escape the market-place, and use the profits for the formation of independent co-operative communities on the land. The first successful co-operative society was established in London in 1824, and by 1832 there were between four and five hundred in existence.[37] These were relatively small scale, and concentrated in the industrial north of England.[38] In the face of the development of industrial capitalism however, Owenite communitarianism repeatedly failed,[39] and as a consequence, this form of co-operative society faded out from the mid 1840s.[40] What replaced it in the second half of the nineteenth century was the retail or producer co-operative, which had as its end the retailing of goods of an assured quality at a fair price, and which functioned as a means of thrift through the distribution of a dividend to members.[41]

---

[37] Kelly p 136
[38] Hopkins p 203
[39] ibid p 220
[40] P. Gosden *Self Help: Voluntary Associations in Nineteenth Century Britain* London: B T Batsford, 1973. p 184.
[41] Hopkins p 221. Members who contributed the most by buying the most from the cooperative had the right to the largest share of profits. See Gosden p 181.

Although it was no longer an achievable end, land acquisition often still remained an illusive, rhetorical goal of the retail co-operatives well into the mid Victorian era. The first of these new type of co-operatives was the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers Society, founded in 1844, which was initially set up with the traditional aim of the creation of a co-operative community. Its financial success as a retail co-operative spawned the modern co-operative movement.[42]

In nineteenth-century Christchurch, a number of unsuccessful attempts were made to form the modern type of co-operative society.[43] Significant resonances of the old radical world view still permeated the liberal cultural ethos of the mid Victorian working man however, and the radical idea of the co-operative type land society still held some currency. William Kent, the president of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society in 1866 (see below) attempted to form a co-operative land society as late as 1879, to allow the poor to take up large blocks of freehold land and farm it on a co-operative basis. A block of land on the Waimate Plains in South Taranaki was selected, and organizers undertook to settle as many as eight thousand people in the settlement. After a campaign in Christchurch in December 1879, a roll with five hundred families was assembled, and delegates were despatched to Wellington in order to enlist government support - in particular that of the Minister of Lands, former Canterbury Superintendent, William Rolleston. The co-operative ideal obviously did not appeal to Rolleston, who would not become involved in what he considered a wild scheme. The Owenite ideology of co-operative land-holding was regarded as an anachronism even in England, where conditions were comparatively more conducive to such formation. In the individual achievement-centred world of colonial New Zealand, the likelihood of it succeeding were even less. Despite the initial enthusiasm evinced, the Taranaki scheme subsequently lapsed through want of support.[44] The influence of the old communitarian co-operative idea can also be seen in the debates of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society

---

[42] Hopkins pp 203-204
[43] See chapter 5
[44] Arnold p 264, *MacDonald Dictionary*

(below), where it would seem that a number of members were not fully reconciled to the individual ideals of the new body. Elijah Gadd, for example, wished the society to purchase a large block on which to start a township.

The body which effectively succeeded the co-operative land society as the institutional embodiment of the desire for an 'independence on the land' was the individual achievement-focused freehold land society. A number of freehold land societies were formed in England during the 1840s, with the original aim of buying land and breaking it into parcels in order to facilitate the enfranchisement of supporters. It would seem likely, however, in the light of the meanings attributed to land ownership, that the societies possessed a greater significance for members than this. These societies were managed in a similar manner to building societies, but usually (though not always) constituted on a permanent basis, rather than having the terminating form of the building societies. The idea of permanence eventually spread into the management of building societies from the freehold land societies.

Permanently constituted building societies were often under middle-class direction, but with a workman membership. Heavily represented amongst the directors of these societies were solicitors, auctioneers, land agents, and builders. The strongest support came from tradesmen and other members of what Gosden calls the lower middle class, as subscription rates were unsuited to the poorer workman. The assumption could be made that freehold land societies were of a similar social composition to building societies, and the evidence in Christchurch bears this out.

Terminating building societies (and probably terminating freehold land societies as well) enabled members to subscribe and act jointly until each had acquired property, upon which they would terminate. The closing date was set after a society had been established for a few years, and was determined by the length of time over which the repayment of an advance could be arranged. The repayment period was usually comparatively short, which could make things difficult for members. Deciding the order in which members would take possession, or who would receive advances from the common fund to purchase a property,

was also a problem. A ballot was often used, though the most usual method was an auction. Ultimately, the Archilles heal of many terminating societies was that they were too ambitious and framed their operations on shaky foundations, eventually finding that they were unable to fulfil their objectives.[45]

The economic difficulties of the late 1860's may have encouraged Christchurch's petty bourgeoisie to initiate a more collective approach to attain the ideal of an independence through land ownership. The Canterbury Freehold Land Society was formed as an offshoot of the Working Man's Association in January 1866, with the ostensible object of easing the transition of members into land ownership.[46] J. C. St Quentin, the secretary of the new society 'trusted that it would exert a beneficial effect on the destinies of working men'.[47] It is perhaps revealing that St Quentin did not specify how this beneficial effect was to be achieved, for this suggests that members may have perceived 'independence' through land to have had more than one meaning.

The meaning that has been considered thus far relates independence to the ideal of the self-contained rural idyll, where owners settle and cultivate their land. The rhetoric of the FLS, and the personal expressions of some members would support this interpretation. In pragmatic terms, however, for land to be the basis of one's independence, its ownership did not necessarily have to lead to settlement. For other members of the FLS, therefore, the acquisition of land may have been little more than a convenient and profitable means of investment. The occupational composition of the membership, their places of residence, and

---

[45] Gosden pp 143-158

[46] Eight members of the Canterbury Working Man's Association have been identified as belonging to the Canterbury Freehold Land Society. The society was not the only such institution to be initiated at around this time. Later the same year, the *Lyttelton Times* announced that another such group, the Lyttelton Land Society was progressing well, and considering its first purchase for division among shareholders. It cannot however have been as successful as the FLS for it does not appear to feature again. (*Lyttelton Times* 15 September 1866) A similar body also existed in Kaiapoi at this time. It appears there may have been some degree of multiple membership between land societies. Robert England, for example, was on the committee of the Lyttelton Land and Building Society in 1861. It is not clear whether this has any relation to the body which was contemporaneous with the FLS.

[47] *Lyttelton Times* 30 May 1866

the lack of significant change in these elements suggests that property ownership simply for capital gains was more widespread than perhaps first impressions would suggest.

At its inauguration, the FLS proclaimed its modus operandi to be the purchase from the provincial government of blocks in good localities. These were to be subdivided into five-acre plots, which were then to be submitted to a ballot amongst members 'on the principle of the Art Union in England.' In order to enable the association to meet this end, each member was required to pay 2s 6d on joining, and a weekly contribution of 1s 3d for one 'share' (which equated to a five acre block at the ballot), plus a penny for operational expenses.[48] The association constituted itself formally with a secretary, president, vice president, and treasurer, a 'council' of five members, and three trustees.[49] In addition, a solicitor, and probably a surveyor were engaged to undertake the necessary formalities of land selection and registration.[50] In May 1866, it was proposed that the secretary, St Quentin, receive a salary, but he objected as 'he had taken considerable pains to organize the society, and wished to benefit the working classes without fee or reward'.[51] Evidently, however, he changed his mind at some point, for the annual meeting in 1868 resolved unanimously to increase the secretary's salary to the not inconsiderable sum of £80 per annum.[52] In February 1867, the society also undertook to pay the 'council' 3s each as an honorarium for undertaking to receive subscriptions.[53]

The manner in which the society intended to purchase and settle its lands was a matter of considerable debate. There seemed to be an initial consensus that the society should

---

[48] ibid 24 January 1866. A farm labourer's daily wage in Canterbury was 7 or 8s at this time.
[49] The trustees were Richard J. S. Harman, land agent and a manager of the Christchurch *Press*; Francis E. Alport, an auctioneer; and William Reeves, proprieter of the *Lyttelton Times*. See chapter 5.
[50] St Quentin, the secretary, reported in late May 1866 that the Land Office had recommended they hire a surveyor to assist them in their selection and subdivision (*Lyttelton Times* 30 May 1866). Whilst surveying the Waipara selection, he was accompanied by a Mr Beetham, who may have been the man subsequently engaged (ibid 14 November 1866).
[51] ibid 2 May 1866. He was, it would appear, the prime mover behind both the Working Man's Association and the Freehold Land Society.
[52] ibid 26 February 1868. A male labourer was earning between £35 and £60 per annum at this time. (see for eg. 'Labour Market' ibid 5 September 1866). St Quentin initially declined re-election in 1867, but was returned to popular acclaim, and subsequently held the position until the dissolution of the society (*Lyttelton Times* 13 February 1867).
[53] ibid 13 February 1867

found a community, but there was a diversity of opinion over how much land was required for this purpose. John St. Quentin recommended at the outset that they accumulate funds and purchase a large block of 600 or 700 acres 'so that a township might be formed which would increase the value of the land'.[54] A special general meeting was convened at the end of May 1866 to consider the question of how large the society's purchases should be. Alfred Gadd took St Quentin's position, advocating that the society accumulate twice as much capital as it then possessed, and buy twice as much land, as this would be a better quantity with which to form a township. A township, he said, was what they should form, for not only would this secure more value to their land, but also ensure that if difficulties arose, 'there would be more of them to fight their battle'. FLS council member Kent also favoured the idea of forming a township, for he felt that this would encourage further purchases in the vicinity. But he and fellow council member William Wilson considered that a purchase should be made forthwith with the capital then accumulated. Wilson regarded it as more profitable to invest their capital in land than to deposit it in the bank.[55] Members took their lead from Kent and Wilson rather than from Gadd and St Quentin, and voted in favour of the immediate purchase of a smaller block.[56] This may indicate that members were more concerned with the financial rather than the social advantages of land investment. Two years later the society finally settled upon the last week of every quarter to hold a regular ballot for the funds accumulated in the interim.[57]

Allowing for rhetorical flourishes, there may have been a minority of members (other than Gadd and St Quentin) who placed more than a monetary value on land, for there was some debate on the mechanics of subdivision and settlement. Joynt, the society's solicitor, argued against the idea of subdivision into five acre blocks: 'He thought it would be inadvisable to settle too many men on a block, as there would be a difficulty in their getting

---

[54] ibid 2 May 1866
[55] William Wilson was a substantial investor in property. He frequently used land for nursery purposes until it became too valuable, at which point he subdivided or leased. In 1877, he sold the land of his Christchurch nursery, which straddled High St and Ferry Rd for £24, 557. In 1882 he held over 1,700 acres in country lands, and Christchurch property valued at over £45, 000. See appendix 1, fig. 9.
[56] *Lyttelton Times* 30 May 1866
[57] ibid 26 February 1868

labour'.[58] The decision to divide purchases into five-acre blocks was not generally disputed, however, and there was no further response to Joynt's injunction. At the first anniversary soirée of the society, Mr Wilkins said 'he had often been asked.... what was a man to do with five acres of land? He knew that many men got a good living out of five acres, and certainly, that quantity of land was a capital addition to a workingman's estate'. On the same occasion, society trustee, Henry Alport, proclaimed: 'There was nothing like the possession of land to cause people to settle down in a society'. He expressed a desire to meet members who had already settled on their allotments.[59]

At the beginning of July 1866, barely six months after the formation of the FLS, it was announced that a first purchase had been made: 400 acres of an 'excellent quality' on the Great North Road near Waipara. The *Lyttelton Times* observed that 'This is a good beginning, and promises well for the future of the scheme'.[60] In October, the *Times* announced that another selection was about to be made.[61] However, in mid-November, St Quentin reported that the society had run into a problem with its Waipara selection. He and another had surveyed the Waipara Flat land in preparation for settlement, but the local pastoralist had then exercised his right of pre-emption over the block, debarring the society from taking up the land of its choice. Without any apparent rancour at his wasted efforts, St Quentin stated that 'they had done their best', and selected another 400 acre block some five miles from their previous selection.[62] This land on the Waikari Flat, which the *Times* said to be 'of excellent quality, and admirably calculated for agricultural purposes', was balloted for at the beginning of December.[63]

---

[58] ibid 17 May 1866
[59] ibid 7 March 1867
[60] ibid 6 July 1866
[61] ibid 19 October 1866
[62] ibid 14 November 1866
[63] ibid 7 December 1866. The *Lyttelton Times* reported this as the second ballot of the FLS. If this is so, the first was not reported. The mention, in mid-October, of a selection about to be made by the society, could possibly be the land apportioned in the first ballot, or alternatively St Quentin's reselection after losing the Waipara block.

Perhaps as a consequence of having their arrangements for the Waipara selection disrupted, the society decided at its November meeting to convene a special meeting to consider the feasibility of allowing members to choose their own land. When this special meeting took place is not clear, but the issue may have been under consideration at the time of the annual meeting in February 1867, when two members complained of the great variety in conveyancing fees charged to the society, and a flat fee was suggested. In defence of the charges, Mr Ayers pointed out that if members were at some point to select quarter-acre town sections, the ensuing investigation of title would necessitate a great deal of work for their legal advisor.[64] Formal arrangements for individual selection were definitely in place for a ballot for 500 acres in May of that year. The chairman noted that on this occasion the ballot was taking place before the land had actually been purchased, in order to allow any successful shareholder who had become entitled to land equivalent to four shares (20 acres) to select a section for themselves, which the society would finance. He added that it was also permissible for the shareholder who had less than four shares, but was willing to make up the difference to the required minimum, to make their own selection.[65] At the 1869 AGM, St Quentin reported that the (this?) alteration in the mode of selecting land had worked well.[66] The decision of the society to modify its land purchase regulations to allow for individual selection may have been a response to the difficulties of land selection; by having their 'eggs in more than one basket', they were able to ensure that one intransigent squatter could not block all their efforts. The change may also have been an effort to maintain or widen the society's appeal to working men whose ideology was predominantly individualist, and who may have balked at the idea of being required to settle, or at least purchase, where the ballot directed. For the more investment-minded, the new flexible approach would also have permitted the selection of land in areas more likely to appreciate in value.

---

[64] ibid 27 February 1867
[65] ibid 6 May 1867
[66] ibid 17 February 1869

It is difficult to assess the success of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society, and whether it had any discernible impact on settlement patterns. Certainly contemporary comment was invariably sanguine about the society's fortunes and prospects. At the first anniversary soirée in 1867, Cutler, then the president, confidently declared the society to have become 'one of the institutions of Canterbury'. William Travers, the well-known political aspirant whose tenacity during the 1866 contest for the superintendency brought the abuse of the pre-emptive right to public attention, complimented the group for demonstrating the value of co-operation. So to did the society's trustee, William Reeves, who observed that 'union was strength'.[67] Declaring the Waikari ballot a success, the *Lyttelton Times* suggested that 'the promoters are justified in anticipating still larger results'.[68]

On its third anniversary in 1869, the society had received a creditable £5543 19s 1d in total subscriptions, of which £531 6s 7d had been used for working expenses, £628 2s 6d for meeting withdrawals, and £3972 in the purchase of land and estates.[69] Supposing that the majority of the latter sum had been expended on the purchase of government 'waste lands' at the upset price of £2 an acre, then the society must have distributed nearly 2000 acres amongst its membership during this period. Compared with the 167, 000 acres of crown land sold in Canterbury during the period 1866-69, the amount with which the society was involved seems small. However, if one takes into account that much of the crown land sold was distributed amongst the small group of pastoralists, then the role of the FLS assumes more significance.[70] Provincial Councillor Sir John Cracroft-Wilson, for example, alone held 5, 434 acres of freehold by 1867.[71] What is of more value in assessing the impact of the FLS, is determining the number of those who benefited from the society's endeavours. Estimating the total number of beneficiaries is impossible because of a partial record. However, of the 86 members mentioned in the *Lyttelton Times*, 53 were reported as

---

[67] ibid 7 March 1867
[68] ibid 7 December 1866
[69] ibid 17 February 1869
[70] *AJHR* 1870, vol II, section C, no. 3: Return of Lands Sold.
[71] *NZPD* 1867, p 986

receiving some portion of land during the life of the society.[72] At a ballot for three hundred acres held in October 1867, 13 members acquired between 5 and 40 acres each, with the majority receiving 20 or 25 acres.[73] In the other two documented ballots, 400 and 500 acres were divided amongst 21 and 19 shareholders respectively.[74]

The petty bourgeois membership of the FLS probably enjoyed a relative security of employment and income during normal economic times, in comparison with the perpetually unpredictable nature of a wage labourer's circumstances. However, the repercussions of the depression that prevailed from about 1865 until 1870 were extensive and spared no social sector. Between 1866 and 1869 total provincial revenue dropped from a high of £639,747 to only £190,617; expenditure on roads and works from £133,365 to £25,275; and income from land sales from £178,757 to £30,892.[75] The private sector contracted similarly. Provincial export earnings fell by two thirds: from £1,575,062 to £498,323 between 1865 and 1869; and it was reported to the Provincial Council in July 1867 that many skilled artisans were out of work.[76]

The FLS suffered financial problems that were probably a consequence of the depression, although such difficulties also tended to be endemic in terminating societies under normal conditions. At a ballot in May 1867, it was reported that many shareholders had become disqualified through not having kept up their payments.[77] The situation cannot have improved much over the next two years. At the 1869 annual general meeting, the secretary advised of extensive arrears, and recommended that the society enforce their rule that shares be forfeited if shareholders did not square the books after three months notice. Also disadvantageous to the society was a resolution passed in 1867 permitting withdrawals.[78] St

---

[72] St Quentin reported in May 1866 that in the three months since the society had been formed, 977 shares had been applied for to a value of £548 3s 2d - which averages 81 shares a week over the period. (*Lyttelton Times* 2 May 1866) If each member had been purchasing the required minimum of one share per week, then a rough membership estimate of 81 can be formed for this initial period.
[73] ibid 23 October 1867
[74] ibid 7 December 1866, 6 May 1867.
[75] See Appendix 2, Figs 6 & 7.
[76] ibid, Fig 8; and *Lyttelton Times* 20 July 1867. Also see chapter 3.
[77] *Lyttelton Times* 6 May 1867
[78] ibid 17 February 1869

Quentin reported at the beginning of 1868 that weekly receipts had decreased significantly as a result.[79] A year later, he recollected that the society had 'at one time' been 'severely crippled' by withdrawals. If St Quentin is to be believed, however, such drawbacks did not permanently blunt the society's vigour. On the third anniversary of the founding of the FLS, he congratulated members for its continual prosperity since formation.[80]

Nonetheless, the decision seems to have been made during 1868 to wind the Canterbury Freehold Land Society up. At the February 1869 annual meeting, whilst lamenting the negative impact of withdrawals, St Quentin recommended against implementing any changes to the constitution because of the nearness of the date of dissolution of the society, which he said, was some nine months hence. He also mentioned the necessity of drawing in arrears in order that the society could be wound up.[81] A final meeting was held in May 1870, at which the directors of the society were empowered by resolution to dispose of the society's property, wind up its accounts, and distribute surplus funds amongst members.[82] Thereafter the society disappeared from the public record.

There are six possible reasons for the termination of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society. Five of these are predicated on the proposition of a falling membership, which would undermine its financial integrity. The society would thus become less attractive to both prospective and existing members, who would see their own chance of acquiring a plot as increasingly remote. Withdrawals would then grow faster, and the induction of new members decrease, until the point at which the society's viability as a land purchaser was compromised, and winding-up became unavoidable. The first possibility that would initiate such a scenario is that gradually improving economic conditions after 1869 may have mitigated the necessity for workingmen to band together to achieve their 'independence'. Secondly, the society may have accomplished its function, and distributed a plot of land to all

---

[79] ibid 26 February 1868
[80] ibid 17 February 1869
[81] ibid 17 February 1869. Cutler, the society president expressed a hope that when the present society ceased to exist, another would be formed to take on its function. It would appear, however, that no equivalent successor was formed - at least before the end of 1870.
[82] ibid 11 February 1870

shareholders. Thirdly, those who were successful in the ballot may have pulled out. Fourthly, given the fall in land sales, land may not have been seen as the remunerative investment that it had been. Finally, the continuing financial difficulties of members expressed through the extensive arrears to, and withdrawal of funds from the society may have initiated wholesale withdrawals. However, none of these possibilities are supportable, given the apparently strong financial position of the society at its termination, and the lack of evidence of a severe decline in members. Certainly the vast majority of reported land purchases occurred in the first two years of the society's existence, but a steady decline is not evident in the annual value of its purchases. The £1,732 spent on land in the first year decreased to £600 in 1867, but increased again to £1,640 in 1868.[83] The only viable explanation for the short duration of the FLS, therefore, is that it was constituted from its inception as a 'terminating' rather than a 'perpetual' society.

The ostensible object of the society, the acquisition of rural land, would suggest an initially urban domiciled society membership. This contention is supported by analysis of the existing land-holdings of identifiable members. In terms of provincial electorates, twenty-five owned land within the City of Christchurch, twenty-three in the electorates immediately surrounding the city, and only seven further afield.[84] But in the beginning at least, the society appears to have had a wider membership base. The *Lyttelton Times* reported in September 1866 that the organization had bolstered its membership considerably by recruiting in Timaru and its vicinity.[85] No Timaru member ever seems to have benefited from their membership however; the vast majority of successful balloters dwelt in the Christchurch region. For example, of the thirteen beneficiaries of the October 1867 ballot, it was reported that seven resided in Christchurch, four in Lyttelton, one in the Ferry Road and one in

---

[83] ibid 13 February 1867, 26 February 1868, 17 February 1869. This decrease in expenditure in 1867 may have the result of the decision to allow withdrawals.

[84] The landholdings of identifiable members were located (in terms of provincial electorates) as follows: twenty-five in the City of Christchurch; nine in Lyttelton; seven in Heathcote; six in Papanui; two in each of Sefton, Riccarton and Kaiapoi; and one in each of Rangiora, Timaru, Selwyn, and Rakaia. *CPER* 1868 and 1872

[85] *Lyttelton Times* 19 September 1866

Kaiapoi.[86] The contemporary occupations of members also bear out the urban membership thesis. Chapter two shows that they were overwhelmingly self-employed tradesmen/artisans and small retailers, petty bourgeois rather than unskilled labourers. They must also have been among the more affluent of Canterbury's working men, in order to be able to keep up the regular payments required of them.[87]

Considering that the self-descriptive purpose of the Freehold Land Society was to distribute freehold land, the apparent lack of change in the tenure type and residence of members over its four year existence is remarkable.[88] Examination of the 1868 and 1872 provincial electoral rolls reveals that nineteen, or less than half of the forty-eight identifiable members, changed the amount or tenure-type of their land holdings between these dates. Of these nineteen, only about nine appear to have actually increased the value of their freehold or leasehold by purchase or extension. The tenure-type of twenty-three members did not change appreciably over the period. In total, twenty members held leasehold only, seventeen combined ownership of freehold with leasehold, and five held freehold only.

What is even more surprizing, however, in light of the ideal of a rural independence, is the distribution of rural land amongst members. Despite the operation of the FLS, fully thirty-two members held only urban land. Some nine held rural property, but only six of these holdings were apparently large enough to be economic farms. Only four members showed evidence of having given up their urban holdings for an entirely rural existence! In addition, five of the nine rural holdings were in the immediate vicinity of Christchurch, and

---

[86] ibid 23 October 1867

[87] The occupations of thirty-three of the forty-eight positively identified members of the Freehold Land Society have been ascertained. The occupational composition of the FLS differs slightly from the Working Man's Association in that there appears to be slightly fewer tradesmen from the construction industries in the former. Occupations of FLS members were as follows: publican (four, of whom at least two were previously tradesmen); cabinet makers (three); painter, brewer, builder, baker, draper, contractor, plumber, cordial manufacturer, and customs agent (two of each); butcher, tailor, grocer, storekeeper, chemist, ships chandler, hair dresser, miller and grain merchant, nursury man, estate and land agent, and sawyer (one of each). See *Wises* 1872 and *MacDonald.* Eighteen of the forty-eight held more than one land holding - whether leasehold or freehold. Such multiple holding could suggest either home and income, in the form of rental premises, or home and workplace. Only eight members were actually enumerated as leasing or owning a workplace: two hoteliers, a contracter with a yard and workshop, and five with shops. CPER 1868 and 1872.

[88] See appendix 1, fig. 9.

six of the rural land-holders held urban and rural lands concurrently.[89] This might suggest that the rural holdings were being managed in conjunction with urban occupations. The puzzling lack of any apparent rural settlement is supported by an examination of the successful balloters for the Waikari block. There is no evidence that any ever settled, or even held on to their land.[90] The only conclusion that can be formed is that FLS members consistently remained in their petty bourgeois occupations, and in their Christchurch urban and suburban locations.

Why then did the FLS have no discernible impact on the lifestyles of members? It is possible that the ideal of a rural 'independence' soured in the cold light of the economic reality of the late 1860's. More likely, however, it was never the intention of the majority of members to put down roots in the soil in the first place. As a permanent urban petty bourgeoisie, they equated land ownership with the values of independence, but perceived it in the more limited terms of a socio-economic investment, rather than ever intending to live out the rural ideal themselves.

Conclusion

Land was central to both the radical and liberal ethos because the values that small ownership was believed to propagate were considered socially desirable. The problems of British society were perceived to be rooted in an estrangement from the bucolic life that rural land ownership engendered. This esteem in which land was held generated something of a political paradox for liberalism, though. As land was a limited commodity, the regulation of its distribution by government was regarded as necessary to preserve social harmony. The logic of a yeoman-like 'independence', however, ultimately prescribed a laissez-faire state. This apparent contradiction was reconciled in the mid-Victorian era by a liberal social consensus that allowed for limited intervention within a wider laissez-faire context. This

---

[89] CPER 1868 and 1879.

[90] An approach was made to the Waipara County Historical Museum in an attempt to find out if any of the beneficiaries of the Waikari purchase had settled their lands. It would appear that none did, for their surnames were almost wholly unknown to local residents. The one exception did not settle in the district until the late 1870s. An examination of the minutes of the Waipara Roads Board, which met in Waikari township at this time, revealed nothing of the FLS.

relation of land ownership with the ideal of social and economic independence assumed a particular significance for the petty bourgeoisie. Their often precarious, dependent economic circumstances contrasted with what they perceived as the apparent security of the land-owning yeoman. This generated a strong attachment to the values and meaning of tangible property.

The decision to emigrate to New Zealand was made by many on the basis of the possibility of achieving an 'independence'. The ideal means of acquiring an 'independence' was the accumulation of the so-called market advantages of skill and capital through a rural apprenticeship. This would enable the eventual acquisition of rural land. The expressions of the members of the WMA on the principles of access to land, together with the formation of the FLS, suggest that a landed 'independence' was as meaningful to the immigrant petty bourgeoisie as it was to other settlers. However, if the petty bourgeoisie were to remain in their familiar occupations, as many did, neither an independence on the land as idealized, nor the path of the rural apprenticeship, would be open to them. The satisfaction of the desire for an independence required they impose their own petty bourgeois reality on the ideal. Firstly, independence acquired a different meaning. Rather than an independence *on* the land, ultimately it became an independence *through* land ownership. The history of the Freehold Land Society shows that although most members paid lip service to the ideology of a rural subsistence, for the majority, independence actually meant pragmatic investment in lands - urban as well as rural. Secondly, the means of the acquiring land were modified. With the rural apprenticeship unavailable, the petty bourgeoisie were encouraged to form collective associations such as the Canterbury Freehold Land Society, to advance their aspirations for an urban independence founded on an idealization of rural life.

CHAPTER 5: VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

As we have seen, liberalism was a social philosophy that sought to open opportunities for individual ability against unfair restriction. In particular, it was adopted and developed as the ethos of a self aware social class who had had their power expropriated - the mid Victorian petty bourgeoisie. In order that they be permitted to take what they regarded as their rightful position in society, members of the petty bourgeoisie held the conviction that they had to demonstrate their fitness, and prove their 'respectability'. This saw the development in petty bourgeois society of institutions that would both express the principles of liberalism in their constitution, and promote self improvement. These institutions included non-conformist denominations, temperance societies, and organizations of economic self-help such as friendly societies. The concern with respectability can be seen to have created something of a quandary for petty bourgeois liberalism, however, for at the same time as encouraging social integration through equality of opportunity, it also served to weaken the force of the demand for equality.

Preceding chapters have examined the occupational background, political concerns, and relation to land possession of a sample of the petty bourgeoisie of mid-Victorian Christchurch. The evidence suggests the existence of strong links between liberal temperament, petty bourgeois class identification, and involvement in a certain range of activities. This chapter extends the analysis to examine briefly the origins of the radical/liberal belief of the individuals in the sample; and their voluntary participation in nonconformist faith, temperance, and other forms of both individual and collective self improvement, so as to assess the degree to which these beliefs and activities coincide with the behaviour expected of this class.

Personal histories of radicalism recall both British and colonial context. The Californian and Australian goldfields were (and are) recognized as a hotbed of 'radical' sentiment. It is possible, therefore, that the goldfields were a significant contributor to the personal radical commitments of those in the Christchurch sample who had been miners, and

who were known as 'radicals' or 'defenders of the working man'. For example, John St Quentin (WMA, FLS) - perhaps the most significant figure in the sample - was reputed to have spent time on the Australian fields.[1] This is borne out by his being much in demand during the West Coast rushes of the mid 1860s for his mining experience, when he was called on to address a number of public meetings in the city. Another central figure in the sample, Samuel Andrews (WMA), and Henry Dunsford (FLS) also spent time on the Victorian goldfields. The goldfields do not, however, appear to figure significantly as a formative experience for the remainder of the sample.

A number of the sample may have been motivated to the espousal of liberal ideas because of past experience of hardship. William Pratt (FLS) gave an account of the long hours he spent working in the dark and ill-ventilated environment of a London drapery as a young man prior to emigration to Nelson in 1843. Consequently he retained an enthusiasm for early closing, which he implemented in his large and prosperous Christchurch business. Richard Parish (WMA) recalled seeing a boy of fifteen transported for stealing a turnip. This, he said, made a strong impression and gave him the urge to help those less fortunate than himself. Bluff Yorkshireman, John Jebson (FLS), worked in coal mines from the age of five and attended night school to enable himself to gain sufficient education to qualify as a mining engineer. The egalitarian, non-sectarian ethos of liberalism may also have appealed to those who had experience of religious or ethnic discrimination. Rowland Davis (FLS), a publican with radical leanings, though London-born was of Irish descent and possibly Catholic.[2] Thomas Joynt, the FLS solicitor; and William Travers, the lawyer and 1866

[1] The St Quintin family were landowners in the Yorkshire Wolds village of Harpham. It is not clear however whether they were gentry or yeomanry. M. Colbeck *Village Yorkshire; a pilgrimage through history and the Broad Acres* London: B T Batsford, 1987. p 138

[2] Neither Parish nor Davis are a definite identification. Londoner Rowland T. Davis was active from the late 1820's in political campaigns promoting the Reform Bill, the abolition of slavery, and Catholic emancipation; and was sometime president of the Engineers, Smiths, and Machinists Union in West London. Emigrating to Wellington in 1839, Davis was a leading advocate of the interests of working men, contributing to the formation of a Working Men's Association in the city in 1840. In 1851 he moved to Lyttelton, where he opened a hotel in the late 1850s which he ran intil 1864, when he shifted to Heathcote. He stood for the Provincial Council in 1853 on the basis of his activist history, and on a platform that included cheap land. Although he lost on this occasion, he subsequently represented Lyttelton from 1857-64. It is noted that he was less outspoken on class issues during these years. He does not appear to have been a member of the Canterbury Working Man's Association, and does not figure in the discussions of the

political aspirant were also Irish, although Protestant. William Cuddon (FLS), a prosperous brewer, was a member of an old Suffolk Catholic family. These few details offer a tantalising glimpse into the possible motivations of some of the sample, but unfortunately insufficient is recorded to form any firm conclusions.

In mid-Victorian Britain, a common indicator of firmly held liberal belief was membership of a non-conformist denomination. Liberalism and nonconformity had a dynamic relation. Non-conformity provided the theological basis from which liberal thought could develop; it politicized its petty bourgeois congregations; and it empowered them to act on their liberal beliefs. In return, the achievement by liberalism of political orthodoxy projected nonconformity into a position of political influence.[3] The petty bourgeoisie tended to gravitate to non-conformity because its doctrine emphasized man's common brotherhood and equality before God, and therefore attested to the dignity and independence of labour. The spiritually-minded 'working class', according to Parry, saw the function of religion as instilling in all men, (and particularly the rich), consideration, mercy, and goodwill. A Church therefore should be concerned with the practical ministration of these values. The Established Church, however, was perceived by many 'working class' as oppressive, exclusive, and condescending.[4] The egalitarian theology of non-conformity in turn inspired an egalitarian administration, and conjointly these features gave the petty bourgeoisie the confidence, experience, constituency, and philosophical and organizational models to demonstrate their competency and politically challenge the elite.

In Canterbury in the 1860s, 'liberalism' was the predominant political and social discourse. It was not, however, a monolithic ideology, and was subject to differing class interpretation. This omnipotence of the liberal paradigm did not, therefore, circumscribe the role of non-conformity in nurturing petty bourgeois liberal values. The colonial non-conformist churches appear to have attracted a similar petty bourgeois social group to their

---

Canterbury Freehold Land Society. This may in part have been due to his age; he was sixty in 1866-7.
DNZB vol. 1, pp 100-1
[3] Dingle p 15
[4] Parry pp 234-6

British brethren.[5] Similarly, there are also clear links between the petty bourgeois WMA/FLS sample and non-conformity. Of the eighteen on whom there is appropriate data, thirteen were non-conformist, four Anglican, and only one definitely Catholic. Particularly prominent among the non-conformists were members of the various Methodist connexions, who constitute ten of the sample.[6] According to the 1867 census, ten percent of the population of Canterbury by denomination were Methodist.[7] This indicates a disproportionate number of Methodists in the sample.

The small Primitive Methodist Church was established in Christchurch in 1860 as a division of the Wellington Plan.[8] One of the two listed preachers was Henry Flavell (or Flavel) (FLS), an early Christchurch Methodist leader who had been the chair of the fund raising committee for the High St Methodist Church, the first Methodist church in Christchurch.[9] Leading Wesleyan Methodists in the sample - who were all FLS members - included John Caygill; John Jebson, a founder of and preacher at the Malvern Church; R. W. England, treasurer of the Lyttelton Church; Matthew Hall, a prominent Kaiapoi member; J. Hopper, of the Selwyn St congregation, who helped open the Hagley Oak cricket club for young Methodists; and F. J. Garrick, prominent in the St Albans congregation. Garrick, a

---

[5] Analysis of the Methodist congregation at Upper Riccarton reveals a mix of tradesmen, skilled workers, and (appropriate to a largely rural community, farmers. J. Cookson *Upper Riccarton Methodist Churvh: A Centennial Retrospect 1886-1986* Upper Riccarton Methodist Church, 1986.

[6] The Weslayan, Primitive, United Free, and Bible Christian connexions of Methodism united in 1896. The Bible Christians did not appear in Christchurch until the 1870's. W. Chambers *Our Yesterdays 1840-1950; being a short history of Methodism in Canterbury, New Zealand* 1950. pp 30-1.

[7] See appendix 2, fig. 5

[8] A 'Plan' was an administrative subdivision.

[9] In the same year, Hugh Bennetts, an 'enthusiastic Primitive' formed a society called 'The Independent Methodist Church' with three others, including Thomas Cooper. Both these men were involved in the anti-immigration/ unemployed demonstrations of the later 1860s. This society met for a year in a building in Market Square with Bennetts as chief preacher. Eight years later, a second Primitive congregation convened in a Manchester St hall with Bennetts and Cooper among the preachers. This was more successful, and the congregation was able to undertake 'extention' (ie missionary) work into Papanui and Knightstown, apparently the home of a number of members of the sample. Knightstown was an community of 'workers' cottages' in what is now the Dover St-Trafalgar St-Edgeware Rd area of St Albans. The area seems to have been a particular stronghold of Methodism; in 1886, 23% of the St Albans Borough declared themselves to be Methodist, which was twice the national average. A Wesleyan church was built in 1869 at the request of residents, although the site was less than a mile from the St Albans Methodist church on Papanui Rd. With the opening of the Wesleyan church, the Primitives withdrew, subsequently holding cottage meetings in the Columbo St/ Montreal St area until the congregation again lapsed. See *St Albans* pp 103-104, Cookson p 3, and Chambers pp 35-6

lawyer, had his Papanui house built by G. Cresswell, a fellow Methodist and FLS member who arrived with the Canterbury Pilgrims.[10] Aaron Ayers (FLS) and John Cutler (FLS, WMA) were leading members of the United Free Methodist Congregation, which opened its first New Zealand church in Addington in November 1864.[11]

The remaining three non-conformists identified in the sample were a Baptist, a Presbyterian, and a Congregationalist. The Congregationalist, George Beath (FLS), was an acknowledged 'Liberal' and the founder and organizer of the YMCA in Christchurch.[12] The sole Presbyterian, Charles Hodge (FLS), is an interesting case having apparently undergone a conversion. He is recorded as being organist of the Anglican Holy Trinity in 1865, but by 1877 held that position at St Paul's Presbyterian.[13] The Anglicans in the sample were J. Morgan (WMA), William Vincent (WMA, FLS), and J. T. Wilkin (FLS). The latter two were vestry men at St Michael's and Holy Trinity (Lyttelton) respectively.[14]

The religious values of non-conformity and the secular social values of liberalism did not always cohere neatly however; and this is particularly evident in the issue of education. The liberal concern for self-improvement as a means to demonstrate respectability and independence promoted the idea of education. The parallel advocacy of equalitarian values also saw non-conformity invest education with particular significance. Non-conformity was not, however, the only medium to emphasize this value. The stress on rationality as a component of self-improvement also encouraged what was in effect the negation of non-conformist piety, secularism - an equally valid expression of liberalism. Secularism was a distinct part of the radical heritage of the mid-Victorian liberal workman. It had many working-class supporters because of a desire to demonstrate release from the

---

[10] Chambers p 10. Cresswell also built the houses of J. T. Peacock and C. W. Turner, two other prosperous doyens of the Methodist community in Christchurch.
[11] Cutler is identified as I. Cutler in J. Cocker *Temperance and Prohibition in New Zealand* London; The Epworth Press, 1930. p 33. This is probably an error on Cocker's part.
[12] Another Congregationalist was involved in the 1867 agitation. This was R. Binstead, a fervently religious man who became the agent of the Bush Mission in Canterbury, travelling to remote areas to hold prayer meetings.
[13] An even more remarkable conversion however must be that of the Primitive Methodist preacher Hugh Bennetts (see footnote 8). By 1884 he was Peoples' Warden of the Anglican St John's in Latimer Square.
[14] St. Michael's became 'High Church' in 1910.

illogicality of superstition. They defended it as the only valid means of educating working men out of 'pagan darkness' and securing equal rights for all classes through developing the freedom of the individual mind. There was, however, some concordance of opinion between non-conformists and secularists regarding the form education should take, as non-conformists supported a non-denominational education system because of their concern for dis-establishment.[15] In the mid-Victorian era, though, secularism seems to have been swamped as a separate, alternative expression of independence by a tide of enthusiastic non-conformity. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that secularism may have retained something of a marginal presence through the 1860s in Christchurch. John St Quentin (WMA) was accused during his 1866 election campaign of advocating the removal of the Bible from schools, which he denied. Even if unfounded, this allegation may have been an indicator of St. Quentin's privately expressed secularist sympathies. Probable former WMA member Henry Pratt was president of the secularist Canterbury Free Thought Association in 1883.

Next to non-conformity, the movement that best expressed a commitment to liberal values was temperance - the practise of moderation in, or abstinence from the consumption of alcohol. Temperance held great attraction for the liberal because of its appeal to the concept of respectability. As we have seen, a consistent theme of the mid-Victorian era was the liberal struggle by the petty bourgeoisie against the restrictive paternalism that pervaded society, to open opportunities for individual talent. A corollary of this was the creation of an alternative or ideal social hierarchy based on personal effort. The socio-economic apogee of this hierarchy was the 'self-made man', whose prosperity was a function of his own achievement. This was clearly manifested in the colonial attitude to land. Central to progress within this individualized, achievement-based (meritocratic) hierarchy was the manifestation of respectability. This criterion was achieved through individual moral restraint. Temperance, as a tangible expression of such moral restraint was perceived to be a step towards the respectable lifestyle, and thus up the social hierarchy. Consequently Harrison

---

[15] Parry pp 234-237

calls temperance the 'movement par excellence' of the self-made man.[16] Drink, by contrast, prevented the realization of one's potential; intemperance was a sign of an individual's moral weakness. Respectability, as expressed through temperance, became an important defining mark of the petty bourgeoisie as a class, for temperance was an easy means by which the temperate and righteous workman could distinguish himself from those considered intemperate and unrighteous - particularly the unskilled working class and the aristocratic governing class. In time this differentiation hardened into an insular hostility.[17] Thus it can be seen that, in a more secular sense, temperance encompassed the same set of liberal values that appealed to non-conformists. As a consequence, members of the English movement exhibited the same social profile.

Denominationally, non-conformists predominated in the English temperance movement, and as such, it was an important means of uniting the non-conformist community. This support was the product of a blend of liberal thought, non-conformist theology, and evangelicalism. English adherents therefore were mainly Methodist and Quaker; Anglican adherents were negligible.[18] Many of the temperance advocates in the Christchurch sample were Methodist. John Cutler (WMA, FLS) and Aaron Ayers (FLS) were, for example, members of the United Free Methodist Congregation in Addington, a church which was particularly noted for its temperance work.[19] As a function of their spiritual convictions, temperance leaders tended to support other religious and missionary movements. This, in conjunction with the concern for respectability and self-improvement, also saw a broad reforming interest in humanitarian and educational endeavour. Leaders were sometimes divided by reform movements, but tended to choose causes that would unite rather than divide their cause.[20] One cause, however, that its non-conformist backing precluded

---

[16] Harrison p 150
[17] ibid pp 194, 222
[18] ibid pp 163, 169
[19] Cocker, p 35.
[20] Educational involvements included the management of schools, libraries, and mechanics institutes. Other reforming interests included particularly those that would inculcate thrift, such as savings banks, building societies, and free-hold land societies. The democratisation of property ownership, says Harrison, was 'decidedly' a teetotal policy. pp 175-176

temperance advocates from supporting was secularism. There is a certain irony in this when one considers the prominent early Victorian link between atheism and temperance, when freethinkers were leading exponents of rationality and self-improvement.[21]

Typically temperance was strongest in the north of England, particularly in Lancashire and Yorkshire.[22] It was also an urban phenomenon, located particularly in the 'frontier' of the new industrial towns, where traditional hierarchies, institutions, and denominations were weak or absent, and society was changing rapidly. This situation had a parallel in colonial societies such as the United States, where temperance was popular. Adherents were in predominantly urban, but not governing-class occupations.[23] Harrison writes that shopkeepers, clerks, and what he calls the 'better class' of workmen were the class from which temperance societies recruited - the petty bourgeois occupations.[24] Without the same non-conformist liberal fervour burning in their veins, the other classes and denominations of English society gave temperance at best a lukewarm reception.

The socio-political ideology of the teetotaller was the classically liberal idealization of a rural small-holding and craft-working society; an independent, self-regulating society without aristocratic domination. Translated into the context of an urban, industrial society, this meant broadly that economic relations should not prevent individuals from achieving personal independence.[25] As a consequence, temperance was closely integrated into both Chartism, and later, the British Liberal Party.[26] Because of its popular liberal character, temperance created a cross-class (but not pan class) reforming movement that acted as non-conformity did to bind together a part of the working class with employers. Middle-class manufacturers, and especially those in textiles, were the largest occupational group amongst major temperance supporters in England.[27] As such, says Harrison, it was one of several

---

[21] ibid pp 173, 184-185
[22] ibid p 148.
[23] ibid p 220. These governing class occupations included land owning, law, the (established) church, the civil service, the armed services, and of course, brewing.
[24] ibid p 287
[25] ibid p 169
[26] ibid pp 387, 162
[27] Dingle p 15

mid-Victorian agencies that delayed the emergence of a distinct working-class ideology.[28] This conclusion, however, presupposes the historic inevitability of the emergence of a distinct working-class ideology, and indeed the existence of a monolithic working class, neither of which were self evident in the popular liberal milieu of the 1860s. Temperance reformers were also, according to Dingle, the pacesetters for social change in mid-Victorian England, because of the degree of social reorganization they considered necessary to remedy the problem of intemperance; and their willingness to move beyond prevailing notions of political action and the role of the state in order to achieve that remedy.[29]

Temperance began in the early nineteenth century encouraging voluntary abstinence. This so called 'moral suasionist' method gave way around mid-century to the advocacy of legislative enforcement.[30] This reflected the determination of many liberals to free human capacity, and expressed their new found faith in the capacity of the state to act in the best interests of the people. It may also be seen to demonstrate a lack of confidence that temperance could bring about significant change working at the level of the individual. The new assertiveness supported two strands of opinion, 'teetotalism', which wished to regulate the production and consumption of alcohol, and 'prohibition' which desired an outright ban. The leading temperance organization in Britain was the United Kingdom Alliance. Founded in 1853, this was committed to the achievement of total prohibition through legislative means, and increasingly campaigned on a national scale. Temperance pressure led to the passing of a moderate Licensing Bill in 1872, but central to the Alliance's platform was the campaign for a Permissive Bill. Seen as a temporary compromise on the road to total prohibition, this was formulated to give the ratepayers the power to ban drink in their district if two thirds agreed. Such a bill, it was felt, would make abstinence, and therefore respectability, easier and more widespread. It was also an expression of the desire for self government. As a demand for state intervention, the Permissive Bill illustrates the dynamic of mid-Victorian liberalism,

---

[28] Harrison p 395
[29] Dingle p 8
[30] S. Eldred-Grigg *Pleasures of the Flesh: Sex and Drugs in Colonial New Zealand 1840-1915* Wellington: A H & A W Reed, 1984. p 178

where intervention was permitted and indeed desired to the extent of eliminating social abuses and providing a metaphorical 'level playing field'.[31] In many ways, temperance was the driving issue of liberal politics. It also illustrates the inner tension of mid-Victorian liberalism, where compulsion could be employed to make people 'free'. From 1868, the British parliament was sympathetic to the cause of temperance, but the movement was itself divided over the object of legislation. Support for the Permissive Bill was not unanimous,[32] and the dogmatism of the Alliance stifled the consideration of more moderate alternatives. This precluded the temperance movement from bringing about practical reform.[33]

Temperance in New Zealand was weak, divided, and small in its early years, into the 1880s.[34] According to McKimmey, the swing from moral suasion to legislative suppression began early, perhaps on account of this weakness. One of the earliest vehicles of prohibition was the Total Abstinence Society, founded in Christchurch in 1861.[35] Yorkshiremen John Cutler (WMA, FLS) [36] and the Caygill brothers John and James (one of whom was a FLS member), Dr Florance (WMA, FLS), and Charles Worth (WMA) were all active members in the city during the 1860s.[37] Worth, a staunch teetotaller who was apparently in demand as an orator, served variously as president and secretary. During 1866 the Society interviewed the candidates for the Superintendency, Provincial Council, and the General Assembly to ascertain their commitment to prohibition. In 1867, a local version of the United Kingdom Alliance, the Canterbury Alliance, was established, with the enthusiastic Cutler as agent and collector. The immediate aims of the provincial body may have been strict control rather than prohibition, for John St Quentin (WMA, FLS), another Yorkshireman, was said to 'favour' the Canterbury Alliance, although not an abstainer

---

[31] Dingle pp 17-19. This is a modern phrase.
[32] ibid pp 28-29
[33] ibid, p 224-7
[34] P. McKimmey *The Temperance Movement in New Zealand 1835-1894* Auckland University: History Thesis, 1968. p 62, 205.
[35] ibid p 55
[36] Cutler addressed a meeting of the society in 1863, at which time it was said to be waning.
[37] Hugh Bennetts, unemployed agitator, was also an active member, and later a member of the Heathcote Liscensing Board.

himself. The 'local option' was introduced to New Zealand by the passing of an ineffective permissive bill in Auckland province in 1871, but it was not until 1893 that an act was passed that effectively established the option at a national level.[38]

What were to become New Zealand's three main independent temperance organizations were developed on a permanent basis during the 1870s, although they were not to become a political force until the 1890s. All supported prohibition. These were the Independent Order of the Rechabites, the International Order of the Good Templars and the Sons and Daughters of Temperance.[39] The first two operated as abstemious friendly societies. Temperance operated its own friendly societies because contributions to such societies were usually paid at a public house - which yielded too strong a temptation. The first, and most significant of these was that of the Rechabites. Formed in 1835,[40] and first established in New Zealand in 1843,[41] it was not represented in Christchurch until 1877.[42] The Templars began in New Zealand in Invercargill in 1872,[43] but declared a national Grand Lodge in Christchurch in 1874. Samuel Andrews (WMA) was elected Grand Chief Templar; John Caygill (FLS), treasurer; W. Mill (WMA, FLS), secretary; and W. Smith (WMA), assistant secretary.[44] Cutler later served as treasurer.[45] Andrews was also Patriarch of the Sons and Daughters of Temperance, established in New Zealand in 1871.[46] The father of FLS member Henry Flavell was reputedly a total abstainer - though this says little of Flavell himself.[47] Henry Alport (FLS member and trustee) took part in the 'Penny Readings' scheme, which began in 1868 as a means of occupying workmen in the evenings to keep them from the hotels. As many as seven hundred used to assemble at the Christchurch Town

---

[38] Cocker, pp 145-6, 149
[39] McKimmey, pp 55-56, 93
[40] Gosden p 59
[41] Eldred-Grigg *Pleasures of the Flesh* 1984. p 178.
[42] Cocker, p 191
[43] Eldred-Grigg *Pleasures of the Flesh* 1984. p 179
[44] Cocker p 195.
[45] Political aspirant E. J. Wakefield joined the Templars in Wellington during the 1870s.
[46] S. Eldred-Grigg *Pleasures of the Flesh* 1984. p 179.
[47] Unemployed agitator and publican M. B. Hart was also a total abstainer for a period. He addressed the Christchurch Temperance Society in 1861.

Hall for this purpose. J. Hopper (FLS) was in later years a member of the Sydenham Licensing Committee.[48]

Some abstainers were sufficiently committed to the cause that it defined their work. Worth (WMA) opened the Hope Coffee Shop and Boarding House in Market (Victoria) Square in the 1850s, and enlarged the premises in 1863 to include dining, reading, and more bedrooms.[49] In a society as drink-sodden as colonial Christchurch, however, temperance could be a difficult course to sustain, and some advocates were all too human. A legend has grown around St Quentin (WMA, FLS), that suggests that he carried out his better decorative work (such as the 1865 painted ceiling of the provincial council chamber) when warmed with brandy. E. J. Wakefield's later life was clouded by alcoholism and disgrace; he was fined in 1869 with being drunk and incapable.[50] Formerly staunch teetotaller Worth (WMA) underwent a serious regression in 1867 when he applied for a license for his temperance hotel. His subsequent career must have been grist to the mill of his former temperance colleagues, for the application signalled a gradual deterioration in his circumstances. Worth transferred all his property to his wife's name in 1867, and was declared bankrupt the following year. Creditors were making enquiries about the transfer of assets in 1869, and by 1871, Worth was before the magistrate for mistreating his wife.[51]

There was a small but significant presence of publicans and brewers amongst the membership of the Working Man's Association and the Freehold Land Society. This may have been a point of conflict with the more temperate subscribers. William Parish (WMA) was proprietor of the 'George and Dragon' on the Main South Road; William Samuels (WMA) of the 'White Horse' in Tuam St; and William Savage (FLS) of (respectively) the

---

[48] The 1881 Licensing Act split the country into licensing districts, and established Licensing Committees', to be elected annually by the rate-payers of a district. Members were not necessarily temperance advocates, but the committees proved one way of controling the drink trade. See Cocker pp 49, 145-8

[49] Hugh Bennetts, the Primitive Methodist was running the Star Temperance Hotel in 1862. He gave this up to go farming in in 1863, but sold out in 1865, and by 1870 was again running a temperance hotel.

[50] See also *DNZB* vol. I, p 576.

[51] M. B. Hart ceased to be a total abstainer during the mid 1860s because he said he could not be both an abstainer and proprieter of the White Hart Hotel - a prominent hostelry he had opened in 1851! By 1867 he was on the committee of the Licensed Victuallers Association with Morton; and in his later career as a city councillor and mayor, had a reputation for being 'noisy and truculent', as he had often had too much to drink.

Selwyn Accommodation House in 1865, Slades Hotel in 1866, and then the Scotch Stores - a liquor outlet. J. W. Morton (FLS) was a prominent hotelier and chef who during the 1860s held, successively, the licenses of the Oriental, Birdsey's (renamed the Commercial), and Morton's Marine Hotel in Sumner. In 1867, he was also chairman of the Licensed Victualler's Association. William Vincent (WMA, FLS), an original Canterbury Association purchaser, entered into partnership in the City Brewery in 1861. In 1866 he was secretary of the Canterbury Brewer's Association. William Cuddon (FLS) began a brewery in 1869.

The Christchurch sample thus appears to include a number of leading temperance advocates amongst its members, particularly from the WMA, where at least one third had some temperance connection. Although there were brewers and publicans in the ranks of both groups, this was more characteristic of the FLS. Temperance therefore serves as a distinguishing factor, revealing that the two organizations, although similar, were not entirely contiguous in profile. There were both liquor retailers and abstainers within the Freehold Land Society. How could two potentially intractably opposed groups reconcile themselves to co-operation within this organization? This may have been because the numbers of temperance activists in the FLS were small. Additionally, the narrow focus of the organization may have precluded friction. The difference of the FLS from the WMA also serves both to indicate the diversity of the petty bourgeoisie, and to demonstrate that it was possible to subscribe to liberal precepts without necessarily adopting the more extreme expressions of such precepts. Temperance was therefore an important but not definitive class characteristic of the Christchurch petty bourgeoisie.

Non-conformity and temperance were two indicators of a petty bourgeois, liberal status. The remainder of this chapter considers other forms of voluntary association that feature in the sample and demonstrate this character. Some of these express an individualized form of self-improvement, and others, a more collective response. Yet others appear simply recreational, though they may be vested with social significance. It is something of a liberal paradox that the route to an individualized independence was so often expressed through

collective enterprize, in the same way that a laissez-faire state was to be achieved through government intervention. According to Hopkins, self-help organizations diversified and multiplied in the period 1830 to 1870.[52] These organizations included co-operative societies; working men's clubs; mechanics institutes; mutual improvement associations; free thought associations; various forms of land, building, and/or investment societies; municipal and other forms of local self government; trade unions and sports. Building, land, and the early type of co-operative societies; the political forms of local self government; and trade unions have been dealt with previously. Here the means of thrift, or economic self improvement other than land will be considered.

Friendly Societies, writes Thomson, 'were mutual benefit associations in which workingmen... pooled a portion of their income by way of small regular contributions, managed their own finances, and paid welfare benefits to one another in times of need.' Appearing in Britain from the late eighteenth century, they were a popular vehicle for both thrift and conviviality.[53] Gosdon suggests they were the most important means of self help.[54] In England, membership (like most temperance organizations) was concentrated in Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire; and amongst the better paid urban skilled workmen, as the unskilled, whose income was limited and irregular could not keep up regular payments.[55] In New Zealand however, friendly societies did not readily take root, and were weak and largely irrelevant as a means of thrift .[56] This may, at least initially, have been a function of their establishment in this country immediately before or during the depressed late 1860s. In England, for example, discretionary income was tight amongst

---

[52] Hopkins p 6

[53] Thomson p 8. The convivial quality of friendly societies was a major attraction. The majority of societies offered three forms of social activity; a monthly club night, an annual or biannual feast night, and the support of members at funerals. The meeting room was often in a hotel, where the landlord would supply the room in return for the custom that a meeting would generate. This pattern of association resembles that of the Christchurch WMA and the FLS. see Gosden p 22-23

[54] Gosden p vii

[55] ibid pp 40, 46; Hopkins p 13

[56] Thomson p 8

working men at this time, and resignations from the Oddfellows reflected this - growing steadily from 1864 to 1869.[57]

The characteristic weakness of friendly societies in the colony would appear to be manifested in the Christchurch sample, who show little evidence of joining in significant numbers. As previously noted, John Caygill (FLS), Samuel Andrews (WMA), and E. J. Wakefield were members of the abstemious Good Templars. James Gapes (WMA) and Thomas Stapleton (FLS) were both Foresters, and Gapes also a Freemason. Andrews was also a Mason, serving as secretary of the Canterbury Lodge.

Another form of self help that was popular in certain areas of Britain but not in New Zealand was the retail co-operative. Gosden describes these consumer co-operatives as the combination of small retail buyers who got what members wanted at wholesale prices and returned a surplus or profit by dividend. Modelled on the famous Rochdale Equitable Pioneers Society (1844), whose financial success spawned widespread imitation during the 1860s and 1870s, the modern co-operative movement provided an effective answer to the material needs of working people.[58] The movement resembled friendly societies in that it centred on the industrial north, and catered for the better off workman.[59] Most co-operatives were temperate but neutral in religious and political matters, though there were links with political liberalism and non-conformity.[60]

The urban, industrial, and collectivist context that gave rise to the British retail co-operative contrasts markedly with the small scale, semi-rural, and more individualistic environment of colonial Christchurch, which may account for an apparent lack of interest in the formation of such enterprizes here. John Cutler, variously president of both the Working Man's Association and the Freehold Land Society, was a member of the committee of a co-operative called the Christchurch Pioneers' Society in June 1864. There is no evidence that

---

[57] Gosden p 42. This may have been the reason for the difficulties of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society. Many friendly societies were constituted in an unscientific manner which allowed them to collapse readily. See Hopkins p 15
[58] ibid p 180-188
[59] Hopkins pp 203, 221
[60] Gosden p 205

this institution was sustained, however, and MacDonald comments that all early efforts to form co-operative societies in Christchurch failed.[61] Samuel Andrews was chairman in 1878 of the board of directors of another short-lived attempt to found a co-operative.[62]

More appropriate than co-operatives and friendly societies as a means of economic self-improvement in the individualized colonial context were land, building, and investment societies (or some combination of these elements). In Canterbury in 1867, there were seven land and building societies with a combined membership of 4, 347.[63] The Canterbury Freehold Land Society fits within this context, and so little need be said specifically on land societies here.[64] In the same manner as land societies, building societies were sometimes constituted as 'permanent' but often as 'terminating'. The object of 'terminating' building societies, as with terminating land societies, was to enable members to subscribe and act jointly until each member had built, at which point the societies would expire. These tended to be directed by members of the petty bourgeoisie. By contrast the 'permanent' societies were often directed by members of the middle class, though supported by a petty bourgeois rank and file. R. W. England (FLS) was a committee member of the Lyttelton Land and Building Society in 1861. John Elliott, a president of the FLS, was a director of the Kaiapoi Land and Building Society during the 1860's. William Kent (WMA/FLS) was apparently working on a building society plan in January 1866.

In addition to the economic form of individual self-improvement typified by these organizations, the ethos of self-improvement was also concerned with the cultivation of the intellect and character. By striving for this improvement, the workman endeavoured to demonstrate that he was the social equal of members of the governing class, and therefore fit to take his place in (particularly political) society. This characteristic manifested itself in early nineteenth century England in a variety of forms, most notably in what became the London

---

[61] 'John Cutler' card,*MacDonald Dictionary*
[62] *DNZB* vol. II, p 7.
[63] Census, *Statistics of New Zealand 1867*
[64] See chapter 4

Working Men's Association of the 1840s, and companion institutions. The Canterbury Working Man's Association was ostensibly a direct descendent.

The outcome of this trend to self-improvement was an organized and increasingly articulate 'working class', that was perceived by the middle class to pose a threat (whether real or not) to their ordered society. In time, however, the governing class came to the realization that they could harness this incipient desire for knowledge in the cause of social control, utilizing it to impose a 'safe', conciliatory value-system on the 'working class'. Therefore many mid and late-Victorian institutions that were ostensibly for the self-improvement of the petty bourgeoisie - such as mutual improvement associations, working men's clubs, and mechanics institutes, actually began as middle-class initiatives. As such, however, they suffered initially from a number of weaknesses. The first and most important of these was that they often underestimated the intelligence, and particularly the social and political idealism of working people. Secondly, they tended to overestimate the formal education of working men. Thirdly, they were dismissive of the need for recreation. The consequence was that they tended to be too patronizing, dogmatic, moralistic, and conservative in social and economic outlook to appeal to their intended clientele.[65] This accounts for the initial mixed success of some of these institutions. In the light of these failures, a re-thinking by the middle class of their social reforming and improvement effort took place in the 1850s and 1860s. The outcome was a distinct shift in emphasis, from a focus on the formal acquisition of knowledge, to a more abstract concern with elevating and refining working people. The need to offer facilities for recreation and amusement was also recognized. As this fitted more closely with the external respectability that the mid-Victorian liberal workingmen felt was important to their emancipation, middle-class sponsored institutions of self improvement became more popular. This success was, however, at the expense of the older, more class-conscious, radical, and more overtly political institutions (such as the Working Men's Associations) that had evolved in the early Victorian period

---

[65] Kelly p 181

under the direction of the petty bourgeoisie themselves.[66] As a rule, the new institutions were determinedly apolitical. Kelly comments that a striking feature of the period after 1850 was the almost complete submergence of the radical strain in adult education.[67] The Canterbury Working Man's Association thus appears to be almost something of an anachronism in the mid-Victorian context in which it appeared. Directed by the petty bourgeoisie, and retaining an overtly political focus, the association had more in common with its radical improving predecessors in early-Victorian England - rather than the liberal consensus institutions of the mid-Victorian period. To some extent this signifies the internal contradictions that liberalism held for the petty bourgeoisie: on one hand, a desire to be assertive and independent; and on the other, a need to be seen to be consensual and respectable.

The most active, and perhaps the only mutual improvement association to form in Christchurch during the 1860s (other than the WMA), was centred on the Methodist stronghold of Knightstown.[68] The St Albans Mutual Improvement Association first convened in 1866 after a number of residents expressed a desire to build a hall and establish a reading room where classes and lectures might be held. Dr Florance (FLS, WMA) was elected first president and John Dixey (FLS) as secretary. The constitution forbade loud talking, swearing or profane language, practical joking, smoking, drunkenness, and (emphasizing its consensual nature) political or religious controversy. The new hall opened in late 1867, and the inaugural lecture was delivered by FLS trustee William Reeves, who spoke on 'Self Culture: the unfolding and expanding of those capabilities which God has implanted within us'. The Association extended its self-improving endeavours beyond the simply intellectual however, for one of their first efforts was to get the drainage of low-lying

---

[66] R. Price 'The Working Mens Club Movement, and Victorian Social Reform Ideology' *Victorian Studies* vol xv no. 2, 1971. p 117-124. Price considers that the most successful of the social reforming institutions of the Victorian era was the Working Men's Club, which placed its primary emphasis on recreation and social intercourse. The Club movement did not establish itself in Christchurch however until after the sample period. Thomas Stapleton (FLS) was a charter member of the Christchurch WMC; and both he, William Gibbs (WMA), and John Thompson (prob. FLS) served as President.

[67] Kelly p 207

[68] See footnote 9

Knightstown improved. Dixey and Florance approached the Avon Roads Board to this end.[69]

Another mechanism of intellectual self improvement was the Mechanics' Institute. Kelly writes that a common charge levelled at British mechanics institutes is that they failed to attract 'working people'. It is true that in much of England, a middle class membership predominated.[70] In Northern England and Scotland, however, the mechanics institute was popular amongst the petty bourgeoisie.[71] Perhaps the southern English pattern was replicated in Christchurch, for only two members of the sample group appear to have been a members of the local institute, founded in 1859.[72] These were William Wilson (FLS), the Scottish nursery man and land speculator who was librarian in 1861; and Charles Worth (WMA), a committee member in 1863. Matthew Hall (FLS) helped to start the mechanics institute in Kaiapoi in 1864. One reason for the apparent lack of appeal to workmen may have been the steadfast refusal of the mechanics' institutes to allow political discussion.

To this point in the discussion, only the participation of the petty bourgeois members of the sample in the self-improving institutions of mid-Victorian Christchurch has been examined in detail. There were however a small number of the middle class who interacted with the Freehold Land Society and the Working Man's Association as members, trustees, advisors, or speakers. Between the two organisations about ten individuals may be identified as bourgeois, though this label is somewhat nebulous and problematic. The wealth of individuals such as William Wilson, for example, was probably far in excess of most of these

---

[69] The prime movers of the Association under-estimated the ability of their membership to pay for the hall, and it suffered financial difficulties as a consequence. The building was let to the Wesleyans for services and to a dame school, but the problems were such that George Gould and R. H. Rhodes were approached for a loan to tide the association over. In 1869 a meeting was held at which the association was re-organized, and this in conjunction with a small grant from the provincial council gave it some measure of financial security; but by 1872 it was again in financial dire straits. The association survived thanks to the generosity of sponsers, and prospered financially during the later 1870s. Over the years the library portion of the organization increased in importance: in 1885 'and Public Library' was added to the title. In 1922 the identity of the old mutual improvement association was subsumed entirely by the St Albans Public Library. See *St Albans* p 72-76.

[70] Kelly p 198

[71] ibid pp 127-128

[72] According to Kelly (p 198), Mechanics Institutes in Britain faded out as local authorities took over their functions. The Christchurch Mechanics Institute became the Canterbury Public Library during the 1870s. St Quentin had tried unsuccessfully to establish a public library in the city in 1868. *DNZB* vol. I p 383.

men.[73] This group consisted of five lawyers (and a lawyer's son), an auctioneer/auditor, a doctor, a journalist, a writer, and a civil engineer/civil servant. It is interesting and perhaps revealing to consider why these men became involved, and the extent of this involvement.

As noted above, a number of mid-Victorian institutions of self-improvement such as Mechanics Institutes, and permanently constituted Land and Building societies began under middle-class direction and tutelage. During the establishment phase, this involvement was countenanced by the petty bourgeois membership because of the legitimacy conferred on it by their liberal beliefs, and the access it provided to funds and administrative expertise. In later years though, middle-class control tended to be accepted more critically.[74] The FLS in Christchurch was not directly managed by the bourgeoisie, but it had three middle-class trustees and by this criteria was therefore much more a product of mid-Victorian liberalism than the defiantly independent WMA.

The three FLS trustees are a heterogeneous collection. Henry Alport was a prominent citizen, merchant, auditor, and auctioneer. As a large merchant, he may have been perceived by a membership consisting in part of retailers, to be a superior member of their own class. Alport's difference was a matter of degree rather than kind. This is supported by his business partnership with FLS president William Wilson. A politician and journalist, William Reeves was the owner and, after 1867, editor of the *Lyttelton Times*. Reeves held liberal values that influenced those of his more famous son, William Pember Reeves. As we have seen, however, these liberal beliefs did not necessarily match those of the WMA. In his career, Reeves senior filled a variety of both professional and more plebeian commercial positions, which may indicate the determination of bourgeois status in colonial society on grounds other than the simply economic. The third FLS trustee was civil engineer R. J. S. Harman, who from 1857 operated a prominent land and estate firm with E. C. J. Stevens. Consequently, he had experience in the acquisition of land that the FLS may have recognized as an asset to their operation. Harman was also a manager of *The Press,*

[73] In this case, I have distinguished 'professional' type occupations as bourgeois.
[74] Price pp 130-1

and a respected public figure, having been a public servant (provincial treasurer and emigration agent), a provincial councillor, and a great promoter of games and sports.

When one considers those who were recognizably middle class, and who were members of the FLS and/or WMA, it is illuminating to see how history remembers them. Dr Augustus Florance, a member of both the WMA and the FLS, was a St Albans doctor and apparently the son of an English judge. According to MacDonald, Florance was also an acknowledged eccentric. A keen advocate of the rights of working men, he had a reputation for getting carried away by some idea, and was perceived as 'perhaps a little mad'.[75] Fellow FLS member F. J. Garrick, a leading lawyer and prominent Wesleyan, was like Florance, said to be an 'unsound man'.[76] It is possible that they were considered to be 'mad' because of their willingness to engage with a petty bourgeois version of liberalism that was outside the experience of their class. Being seen as 'mad' may also have been a convenient means for these men to explain away their heterodox ideology. Both would have been in close contact with working men as a consequence of their careers, and Garrick's Methodism would, in addition, have engendered a particular identification with the petty bourgeoisie and their values.[77]

Besides Garrick, there was one lawyer directly involved with the FLS. This was Thomas Joynt, the Irish-born Freehold Land Society solicitor. His son was also a member.[78] There were other lawyers, however, who expressed the concerns of the petty bourgeoisie when addressing members: particularly William Travers, William Moorhouse, and Henry Wynn-Williams.[79] The attraction of these lawyers to the issues of working men can be seen

---

[75] *MacDonald Dictionary*

[76] Another eccentric gentleman associated with members of the WMA and the FLS during the unemployment agitations of the 1860s, and who was a keen advocate of the rights of working men, was the controversial Edward Jerningham Wakefield; a political dilettante and writer with a reputation for 'instability' and 'flawed brillance'. Like Florance, he died in poverty. *MacDonald Dictionary* and *DNZB* vol I, p 575-6.

[77] Harrison p 159.

[78] Nothing is known of the circumstances of Thomas junior. He may have joined the FLS as an investment on the advice of his father.

[79] Wynn-Williams, a prominent city councillor, is described by MacDonald as a 'temperamentally pugnacious' and quarrelsome character who loved leading protest against the government. Of a 'Liberal frame of mind', he became well known during 1865 for his leading role in the 'Ratepayer's Mutual Protection Society', otherwise known as the 'Dirt and Darkness Club', a rates rebellion that brought the city council to its knees. See the *MacDonald Dictionary* and Scotter p 235.

in a number of ways. Firstly, there was a practical concern with electoral politics. Secondly, there might be a professional concern with advocacy, that would contribute to a desire to see workmen equitably represented in appropriate fora.

Beyond those organizations of overt self-improvement already canvassed in this chapter, members were also involved in a plethora of voluntary activity. Although more difficult to relate directly to the liberal imperative, many of these pastimes were of a 'public service' nature, and may be seen equally as manifestations of the desire for self and community improvement and independence. They further demonstrate the extent to which these men were integrated with each other, and their wider communities, by bonds of sociability. These activities included membership of school committees, the Volunteer Rifles, the Christchurch Fire Brigade, and poultry, sports, rowing, music, and amateur theatre clubs. William Vincent (FLS) was chairman of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and the Christchurch Drainage Board. James Gapes (WMA) was also a member of the hospital board, and an accomplished flautist. Music was also important for Joseph Carder (FLS), conductor of the Lyttelton Choral Class at the Anglican Holy Trinity; and for singers Thomas Stapleton (FLS) and Henry Alport, the latter giving charitable recitals. St Quentin (FLS, WMA) was a keen amateur thespian, helping to organize a benefit for the retiring manager of the Theatre Royal. John Dixey, WMA member and St Albans Mutual Improvement Association treasurer, was a member of his local school committee, as were Elijah Gadd (FLS), and Aaron Ayers (FLS). Ayers, Henry Alport, and the three Samuel's brothers (all FLS) were also members of the Fire Brigade. William Samuels founded the brigade in 1860, and Alport was inspector and chief. Joseph Carder was also a member of the Lyttelton Fire Brigade. John St Quentin and Thomas Stapleton were poultry fanciers; St Quentin being a judge in 1864. Participation in, and administration of, sports also figured significantly. St Quentin and Alport helped organize the annual Anniversary Day Sports, and Thomas Stapleton was a member of the Popular Sports committee. Carder and J. C. Childs (FLS) were members of the Lyttelton Trades Boating Club, with Childs on the committee; and the

unstoppable Samuel Andrews (WMA) was a rower and rowing administrator. St Quentin, W. H. Barnes (WMA), Childs, and J. S. Wilcox (FLS) were all members of the Volunteer Rifles, and the tireless St Quentin was on the organizing committee. Carder, Wilcox, and J. T. Wilkin (FLS) were committee members of the Lyttelton Colonists Society; Carder secretary for 1865-66. Wilkin and Carder were also on the committee for the Lyttelton and Port Victoria Horticultural Society in 1868, Carder again filling the position of secretary. William Wilson (FLS) pursued a course of voluntary association unusual for his status as a member of the urban petty bourgeoisie. In addition to his early membership of the Horticultural Society, he was also a member of the Agricultural and Pastoral Association, and organised a Farmers Club.[80]

Conclusion

In order that the liberal petty bourgeois could claim their place in political society, they felt it necessary to demonstrate their social fitness. This saw involvement in institutions that reflected the principles of self-improvement and respectability. Chief among these were non-conformity and temperance. Non-conformity acted to indoctrinate the petty bourgeois with liberal values, and to empower them. There were strong links between the sample and non-conformity - particularly Methodism. Closely aligned with non-conformity was temperance. This was almost a synonym for respectability, and also showed linkages with the sample. The remaining forms of 'self-help' took economic and intellectual forms. The economic institutions included retail co-operatives and land and building societies. The latter was much more popular than the former because of its closer equation with the colonial idea of independence. Similarly, the institutions of intellectual self-improvement did not seem to distinguish themselves amongst the petty bourgeoisie in the early colonial setting, because of the central focus on material indicators of self-worth. Nonetheless, there are still discernible links with the sample. These examples, in conjunction with the further examples of

[80] Although these activities could be seen to be a by-product of Wilson's commercial activities, they also suggest that Wilson, unlike the other members of the FLS, may have seriously intended becoming a farmer. The sheer scale of Wilson's enterprizes could be seen to place him outside the petty bourgeoisie.

community participation show that the web of association that bound the petty bourgeois community together, and into the wider community, was extensive. They also show that participation commonly took the self-improving form that was characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie as a class.

CONCLUSIONS

Liberalism was the hegemonic social and economic creed of the mid-Victorian era. Its central tenet was the achievement of independence. This was because a moral and well-ordered society was understood to depend on individual self-sufficiency. The idea employed a largely mythical golden age of an equalitarian, yeoman-based society as its model; the logical outcome of which was a laissez-faire state. Paradoxically, the state was also perceived to occupy a central role as the facilitator and regulator of the optimal economic environment for the fostering of independence. These opposed ideas were reconciled by the idea of succession, where the interventionist state would pull back once the ideal had been set in train. This concept of the class-neutral state undermined social dissent emanating from class antagonism. The mid-Victorian period, therefore, is often characterized as one of consensus.

The petty bourgeoisie were major proponents of the liberal ethos. This was a consequence of the particular nature of their enterprize, which led to a fragile economic independence, and conditioned a class identity. The precarious nature of petty bourgeois independence provided the incentive for the advocacy of the liberal ethos. It was for this reason that the petty bourgeois are noted for their adoption of notions such respectability and self-improvement, for these contributed to the idea of a society free of selfish class interest, in which all participants possessed the same opportunity to be independent.

The colonial environment amplified the role of liberal thought in society. This was because immigrants were focused on the attainment of an independence based on the ideal rural 'yeoman' form. Colonial society, therefore, was broadly to be a new liberal social reality. The colonial petty bourgeois idea of independence appears to have been a variant of this 'yeoman' ideal. Rather than focusing on an independence on the land, the history of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society shows that for the small urban proprietor, the reality became an independence *through* land. Although still vested with social significance, land became relatively more important as a means of financial investment.

Corresponding to the greater prominence of liberalism, the role of the state in colonial society also assumed greater significance. The state became the focus of petty bourgeois discontent in Canterbury during the depression of the late 1860s, whilst the Canterbury Working Man's Association took great care to examine the liberal credentials of political candidates. The wide scope of, and lack of practical definition in, political liberalism was problematic. It allowed for a considerable variety of opinion to exist within the liberal discourse, but also set up the potential for internal dissent. Centrally, this reveals itself as a disjunction between colonial petty bourgeois (or 'popular') and colonial bourgeois (or 'elite') conceptions. The evidence appears to suggest that, as a product of their weaker socio-economic position, the colonial petty bourgeois were effectively seeking a more interventionist liberal polity than the bourgeois were prepared to countenance. The internal diversity of liberalism also reveals itself at a provincial government level in differing strategies for economic development, and in disagreement within the petty bourgeoisie as to what constituted a liberal intervention.

What this appears to suggest in terms of understanding the dynamic of mid-Victorian society is perhaps a modified continuity thesis. The petty bourgeoisie took over, or were absorbed by, bourgeois liberal values. But instead of losing their distinct identity, they reinterpreted liberalism in terms of the familiar language of radicalism. Petty bourgeois liberalism became the standard bearer of the old radical concern with opposition to privilege, and engaged the dissent of religious non-conformity. Although ostensibly part of the same social discourse, therefore, bourgeois and petty bourgeois understandings of what constituted liberal practise appear to have diverged. In many ways, the petty bourgeoisie had became more liberal than the bourgeois liberals.

APPENDIX 1; CHARACTER OF THE SAMPLE OF CHRISTCHURCH PETTY BOURGEOISIE

Fig 1: CanterburyWorking Man's Association Membership, as identified in the Lyttelton Times

(note: * denotes membership of Canterbury Freehold Land Society; # denotes uncertain identification)

Andrews, Samuel P. (secretary 1866, following Barnes)
Barnes, William (secretary 1866)
Campbell #
Commander #
Cutler, John *
Ditfort, Christian *
Florance, Dr Augustus *
Ford #
Gadd, Elijah * (committee, 1865)
Gapes, James
Gibbs, William #
Hadley, John or Josiah (bros) #
Kent, Thomas/William (same indivdual) *
Lawrence G. *
Lee #
Lewis #
Mansell #
Marshall (committee 1865) #
Mason, Alfred (chairman 1865) #
Mill, W. T. C. *
Morgan, John (secretary 1865)
Parish, Richard or William #
St Quentin, John Calcott *
Samuels, Edward or Henry (committee 1865) #
Smith, William H. or J. T. (committee 1865) #
Stone, Joseph S. (committee 1865)
Vincent, J. or W. (president, 1866) * #
Worth, Charles

Fig 2: Canterbury Working Man's Association: Occupations

Member	Occupation
Andrews, Samuel P.	Plasterer/Auctioneer/Land Agent/Contractor
Barnes, William	Foundryman/Blacksmith/Engineer/Millwright
Campbell	
Commander	
Cutler, J.	
Ditfort, Christian	Baker
Florance, Augustus	Doctor/Surgeon
Ford	
Gadd, Elijah	Builder
Gapes, James	Painter
Gibbs, William	
Hadley, John or Josiah (bros.)	Ironmonger; Engineer/Wellsinker
Kent; Thomas/William (same)	Cabinet Maker
Lawrence G.	
Lee	
Lewis	
Mansell	
Marshall	
Mason, Alfred #	
Mill(s) J. T. W.	
Morgan, John	Tailor
Parish, Richard	General Dealer, Draper/Importer
St Quentin, John C.	Painter/Decorator
Samuels, William, Charles, or Edward (bros. ?)	Painter/Decorator, Publican; Cabinet Maker; Contractor
Smith, W. H. or J. T.	
Stone, Joseph S.	
Vincent J. or William	(W) Brewer
Worth, Charles	Plasterer/Hope Coffee Shop & Boarding House

Fig 3: Canterbury Working Man's Association: Land Holdings
(source: Electoral Rolls of the Province of Canterbury, 1868 & 1872*)*
(# denotes uncertain identification)

Member	Freehold		Leasehold	
	1868	1872	1868	1872
Andrews, Samuel P.			house/shop, Whately Rd	ditto
Barnes, William	house, George St	rural sec, Wainui	foundry, Manchester St; South Rd, Ricc.	foundry, cnr Whately Rd/ Durham St
Campbell #				
Commander #				
Cutler, John	Knightstown, St Albans	ditto		
Ditfort, Christian			house, 1/8 acre, Tuam St	Madras St
Florance, Augustus		Caledonian Rd, St Albans	Cnr Durham/ Kilmore	
Ford #				
Gadd, Elijah		Hills Rd		
Gapes, James or John (father & son)	pt rural sec 136, St Albans (James)	St Albans (James)	pt town sec 100 (James); house & land, Papanui Rd (John)	St Albans (James)
Gibbs, William	pt sec 33, E Town Belt	ditto		
Hadley, John or Josiah (bros.)		67 acres, Sandhills (Josiah)	house, pt sec 853 (Josiah)	Hereford St (Josiah)

Kent, Thomas/William (same)			house, St Asaph St; town sec 601, Armagh St	house & shop, town sec. 564, 1042; Oxford Tce
Lawrence G.			pt rural sec 30, Avonside	ditto; 200 acres, Mt Grey Downs
Lee, T. #				
Lewis #				
Mansell, William			pt sec 151, Whately Rd	
Marshall #				
Mason, Alfred #				
Mills #				
Morgan, John			house & shop, Glouceste r St.	
Parish, Richard or William #	town sec. 445, 446, Ferry Rd (R)	(R)town sec. 445, 446; pt rural sec. 84, Ferry Rd; rural sec. 1419 Harewoo d Rd (R)		
St Quentin, John C.	part town reserve 152, Manchest er St N		part section adjoining British Hotel	
Samuels, William, Charles, Edward, or Henry #				
Smith, William H. or J. T. #			sec. 90, Durham St; house, pt sec. 248 (W)	
Stone, Joseph S.		50 acre rural sec. W. Eyreton	Cranmer Sq.	

Vincent, J. or William #	house, Colombo St; Lyttelton; Rangiora (W)	house, Colombo St; Lyttelton; Rangiora (W)	house, Colombo St (W)	Colombo St; pt town reserve 105 (W)
Worth, Charles F.			Kilmore St	-

Fig 4; Canterbury Freehold Land Society Membership (identified in the Lyttelton Times*)*
(note; # denotes a number of possible individuals, or an uncertain identification)

Alport, Henry E.
Ansley, R.
Ashbolt, Samuel
Austin, William
Ayers, Aaron
Barrett, Charles or John #
Barrie, T.
Beath, George L.
Bevan, Thomas
Booth, J. or G. #
Bowker, Henry L.
Brooker, W.
Brownlie, T.
Butterfield, Issac
Carder, Joseph
Cartman, John #
Caygill, John or James #
Childs, H. W.
Christie, Alexander
Coffee
Cotton, Mr
Cotton, Mrs
Cresswell, George
Cuddon, William
Cutler, John
Davis, T. (poss R. D.) #
Ditfort, Christian
Dixon, M.
Drummond, William
Dunsford, Henry
Elliott, Mrs
Elliott, John
England, Robert
Flavell, J. or Henry #
Florance, Dr Augustus
Foster, Edward #
Gadd, Elijah
Garrick, F. J.
Goodman, J.
Graham, Mrs A.
Graham, Miss M. M.
Hill, T.
Hiorns, E. V.
Hodge, Charles
Hopper
Howley, William
Jebson, John
Jones
Joynt, Thomas (jun)
Kent, Thomas (William)
Lane, James
Lawrence, Gabriel J.
Lawrence, William
Manning, R.
Mathews, John
McCardell, James
Mills, W. T. C.
Milsom, Miss Cathrine.
Milsom, George
Milsom, Henry J.
Milsom, Joseph
Milsom, Miss Mary Sophia
Morten, J. W.
Mutton, Thomas
Nelson
Parry, John
Pearce, A.
Pearson, J.

Pickering, J. W.
Poore
Pratt, William
Pratt, C. E.
Roach, Frederick or George #
Robinson, Richard
St Quentin, John Calcott
Sanders, S. H. or E. J. #
Savage, William
Smith, Miss D.
Stapleton, Thomas
Stone, Joseph
Thiele, Augustus
Thompson, F. or J. #
Tinker, John
Vincent, J. or William #
Wilcox, John
Wilkin, R. or J. T. #
Wilson, William
Woodward, John

Fig 5:Canterbury Freehold Land Society : Council Membership (source Lyttelton Times*)*

1866

President T. Kent

Vice President J. Vincent

Secretary J. C. St Quentin

Council Sanders
J. Jebson
J. Mills
E. Gadd
Cartman
Booth (elected later)

Trustees R. J. S. Harman
H. E. Alport
W. Reeves

1867

President J. Cutler

Vice President J. Caygill

Secretary J. C. St Quentin

Council Cartman
A. Christie
J. Caygill
H. Dunsford

1869

President J. Cutler

Vice President J. Caygill

Secretary J. C. St Quentin

Council J. Parry
Nelson
J. Mills
E. V.Hiorns
Coffee

Fig 6: Canterbury Freehold Land Society: Occupations
(Sources:MacDonald Dictionary; Wise's Commercial Directory)

Member	Occupation
Alport, Henry E.	Merchant/Auditor/Auctioneer
Ansley, R.	
Ashbolt, Samuel	Groom/Jockey
Austin, William	Plumber/Tinsmith, Marine Engineer (London St, Lyttelton)
Ayers, Aaron	Hairdresser
Barrett, Charles or John	(J.) Publican
Barrie, T.	
Beath, George L.	Draper
Bevan, Thomas	
Booth J. or G.	
Bowker, H. L.	Grocer (Colombo St)/Land & Estate Agent
Brooker, W.	
Brownlie, T.	
Butterfield, Issac	Stonemason
Carder, Joseph	Customs Agent, (Nowich Quay, Lyttelton)
Cartman, John	
Caygill, John or James (bros)	Bootmaker; Compositer
Childs, H. W.	Blacksmith
Christie, Alexander or C (same &/or rel)	Baker/Confectioner
Coffee	
Cotton, (Mr)	
Cotton, (Mrs)	
Cresswell, George	Builder
Cuddon, William	Sawmiller, Grocer/Draper/Brewer
Cutler, John	
Davis, T. (poss. R. D.)	(R.) Publican
Ditfort, Christian	Baker
Dixon, M.	
Drummond, William	

Dunsford, Henry	Sailmaker/Chandler, Custom house/Insurance (Norwich Quay, Lyttelton)
Elliott, (Mrs)	(wife of John)
Elliott, John	Painter
England, Robert	Builder/Contractor
Flavell, J. or Henry	(H.) Tailor
Florance, Dr. Augustus	Doctor/Surgeon
Foster, Edward	
Gadd, Elijah	Builder/Quarryman/Gardener
Garrick, F. J.	Lawyer: Garrick & Cowlishaw, Barr. & Sol.
Goodman, J.	Bootmaker (?)
Graham, (Mrs) A.	
Graham, (Miss) M. M.	
Hill, T.	
Hiorns, E. V.	Plumber/Tinsmith, Publican
Hodge, Charles	Customs Landing Waiter
Hopper, John	Builder, or poss. Hairdresser
Howley, William	Cabinet Maker
Jebson, John	Engineer/Mine Manager
Jones	
Joynt, Thomas (jun.)	son of T. Joynt, Lawyer
Kent, William/Thomas	Cabinet Maker
Lane, James	Butcher: Lane Bros, Cashel St (?)
Lawrence, Gabriel J.	
Lawrence, William	Publican
Manning, R. or William (same?)	Brewer, Barbadoes St
Matthews, John	
McCardell, James	
Mills, J.	
Milsom, (Miss) Catherine	Joseph's daughter
Milsom, George	Soda Water Manufacturer, Kaiapoi
Milsom, Henry J.	ditto, Christchurch
Milsom, Joseph	ditto, Lyttelton

Milsom, (Miss) Mary Sophia	Joseph's daughter
Morten, J. W.	Chef/Publican
Mutton, Thomas	Builder/Contractor/Grocer (Oxford St, Lytt.)
Nelson	
Parry, John	Plumber
Pearce, A.	
Pearson, J.	Gardener or Grocer, (Colombo St)
Pickering, J. W.	
Poore	
Pratt, William	Draper & Clothier, (London St, Lytt.)
Pratt, C. E.	
Roach, Frederick or George (uncle or nephew)	Hatter/Draper; Tobacconist
Robinson, Richard	Chemist, (Cashel St)
St Quentin, John Calcott	Painter/Decorator
Sanders S. H. or E. J.	
Savage, William	Publican/Liquor Retailer, The Scotch Stores, (High St)
Smith, (Miss) D.	
Stapleton, Thomas	Sawyer
Stone, Joseph	
Thiele, Augustus	Baker (Manchester St)/General Storekeeper
Thompson, F. or John	(J.) Miller/Storekeeper, Clerk/Shop Asst
Tinker, John	
Vincent, J. or William	(W.) Brewer
Wilcox, John	
Wilkin, R. or J. T.	(J.) Postmaster
Wilson, William	Nursuryman/Land Agent/Trader/Quarryman
Woodward, John	

Fig 7: Distribution of Occupations of the Membership of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society , in terms of the categories of the 1867 census.

Note: those who carried on various occupations are tabulated separately for each. Compare this table with Appendix 2: fig. 3. In order to standardize the sample to make it comparable with the 1867 figures, the sample percentage is calculated on the assumption that 'unoccupied' women and children equate to half the total membership.

Occupation	Number	% of sample	% of Canty Population (1867)
Trade/Commerce/Manufacture	24	18.1	5.06
Mechanics/Artificers/Skilled Workers	25	18.9	5.8
Agricultural and Pastoral	0	-	7.87
Labourers	0	-	6.16
Legal	1	6.6	0.28 (Professionals)
Clerical	6		
Medical	1		
Teachers	0	0.75	O.6
Surveyors	0		
Other Educated Profesionals	1		
Mariners etc	0	-	1.51
No Occupation (primarily women & children)	-	(50)	52.65
Misc.	6	3.49	3.14
Mining	1	0.75	12.58
Domestic and General Servants	1	0.75	4.06
Total	66 occupations		

Fig 8: Occupations of the Canterbury Freehold Land Society by Type

Catagory	Occupation	Number involved	Subtotal
Construction	Builder	4	
	Contractor	2	
	Cabinet Maker	2	
	Plumber/Tinsmith	3	
	Painter/Decorator	2	
	Mason	1	
	Engineer	1	
	Sawyer	1	16
Manufacturing/Retail	Bootmaker	2	
	Sailmaker/Chandler	1	
	Baker/Confectioner	1	
	Nursuryman	1	
	Marine Engineer	1	
	Quarryman	2	
	Blacksmith	1	
	Mine Manager	1	
	Gardener	1	
	Tailor	1	
	Brewer	3	
	Soda Water Manufacture	1	
	Hatter	1	17
Service/Retail	Publican	6	
	Grocer	3	
	Draper	4	
	Hairdresser	2	
	Groom/Jockey	1	
	Storekeeper	1	
	Tobacconist	1	
	Trader	1	

	Shop Assistant	1	
	Miller	1	
	Chef	1	
	Customs Landing Waiter	1	
	Chemist	1	24
White Collar/Clerical	Merchant	1	
	Clerk	1	
	Auditor	1	
	Auctioneer	1	
	Land & Estate Agent	2	
	Customs Agent	2	
	Compositer	1	
	Insurance Agent	1	
	Doctor/Surgeon	1	
	Lawyer	1	
	Postmaster	1	13

Fig 9:Freehold Land Society: Landholdings
(source: Electoral Rolls of the Province of Canterbury 1868 and 1872*)*

Member	F/hold		L/hold	
	1868	1872	1868	1872
Alport, Henry E.				
Ansley, R.				
Ashbolt, Samuel, or Alfred (prob rel)		0.25 acre, Springfiel d Rd (A)		
Austin, William			house & shop, London St, Lyttelton	ditto
Ayers, Aaron or J. W. (prob A)		house, Lyttelton St (J)	Colombo & High (A)	
Barrett, Charles or John				
Barrie, T. (A Barrie, prob same)				sec 1083, Tuam St W (A)
Beath, George L.		'Clifton Grange', Riccarton	house, Hereford St; Drapery, Cashel St	Drapery, Cashel St
Bevan, Thomas	pt town sec 224			
Booth J. or G.				
Bowker, H. L.				
Brooker, W.				
Brownlie, T.				
Butterfield, Issac				
Carder, Joseph				sec 69, 70, Wincheste r St, Lytt.
Cartman, John			Peterboro ugh St	sec 106, Peterboro ugh; sec 72, Addingto n; 2 acres, Stanmore Rd

Caygill, John or James (bros)		house & land, Caledonian Rd (John)	'Evening Mail' office, High St; house, Stanmore Rd (James)	0.33 acre, Stanmore Rd (James); 2 sec, ChCh, (John)
Childs, H. W.				
Christie, Alexander, C., or D. H. (same &/or relation)		1 acre, Stanmore Rd (D. H.)		
Coffee				
Cotton, (Mr)				
Cotton, (Mrs)				
Cresswell, George/H (same?) or Lane (relation ?)				all Cashel St
Cuddon/Cudden, William	pt sec 1041, Tuam St W	ditto	pt sec 1048, Tuam St W	ditto
Cutler, John	Knightstown, St Albans	ditto		
Davis, T. (poss. R. D.)				
Ditfort, Christian			house, 1/8 acre, Tuam St	Madras St
Dixon, M.				
Drummond, William		0.25 acre & house, S Town Belt; pt sec 25, 26, Canterbury St, Lytt		sec 78, Winchester St, Lytt
Dunsford, Henry			house, Norwich Q, Lytt	pt sec 166, Exeter St, Lytt
Elliott, (Mrs, wife of J.)	-	-	-	-
Elliott, John	pt rural sec 370, Southbrook		residence, Kaiapoi (status?)	

England, Robert	0.25 acre & 2 cottages, Heathcote ; house & land, Exeter St, Lyttelton	0.25 acre & house, St Asaph St		yard & workshop s, Colombo St S
Flavell, John or Henry (prob same &/or relation)		house & land, Chester St E. (H)	Lichfield St (H)	ditto
Florance, Dr. Augustus		Caledonia n Rd, St Albans	Cnr Durham/ Kilmore	
Foster, Edward			pt sec 41, Manchest er St	
Gadd, Elijah		Hills Rd		
Garrick, F. J.	Papanui Rd, Springfiel d Rd	ditto	Cathedral Sq	ditto
Goodman, J.				house & shop, Colombo St
Graham, (Mrs) A.				
Graham, (Miss) M. M.				
Hill, T.				
Hiorns, E. V.				shop & cottage, house & 0.5 acre, both Armagh St E.
Hodge, Charles		0.25 acre & house, S Town Belt, Addingto n (status?)		
Hopper				
Howley, William			Mr Dales Property, Ferrymea d	

Jebson, John	5 sec (150 acres), Hawkins R.; 'Fountain Villa', Addington		2 sec (314 acres), Hawkins R.	
Jones				
Joynt, Thomas (jun.)				
Kent, William/Thomas (same)			house, St Asaph St; town sec 601, Armagh St	house & shop, town sec. 564, 1042; Oxford Tce
Lane, James				sec, Kilmore St W; house & land, Cashel St
Lawrence, Gabriel J.			pt rural sec 30, Avonside	ditto; 200 acres, Mt Grey Downs
Lawrence, William	part sec 271, Heathcote		Papanui Hotel	Papanui Hotel
Manning, R or William (prob same)			Barbadoes St (R)	ditto
Matthews, John				
McCardell, James F.			Kilmore & Barbadoes	pt town res 170 (Jas
Mills, J.				
Milsom, (Miss) Catherine				
Milsom, George			Charles St, Kaiapoi	N Rd, Kaiapoi
Milsom, Henry J.				

Milsom, Joseph	lot 7 & pt sec 7, town reserve, ChCh; 2 houses/1 acre, Raven Q, Kaiapoi	ditto		
Milsom, (Miss) Mary Sophia				
Morten, J. W.		3 x rural sec (22 acres), Sumner	pt sec 81, town reserve	hotel, High St
Mutton, Thomas	town sec 64, 94, Wincheste r St, Lytt	ditto		
Nelson				
Parry, John	0.25 acre, Avon Rd		house & land, Marton St/Colom bo St S	ditto
Pearce, Allan or F.				
Pearson, J./F. J. (same?)		3 sec, Timaru (F)	S Town Belt (F)	ditto
Pickering, J. W. or G. W. (prob same)	pt rural sec 79 & house, Colombo St S	ditto		
Poore, A. E or W. H (prob. relation)				pt sec 7, Salisbury St E (A) ditto + town reserve 162, Madras St E (W)
Pratt, William H.		Riversleig h; 32 acres & house, Heathcote (status?)	town sec 24, Lyttelton; Cashel St	ditto+Wor cester/Ma nchester/ Glouceste r block; Riccarton
Pratt, C. E.				
Roach, Frederick or George				

Robinson, Richard			house & shop, Cashel St	ditto
St Quentin, John Calcott	part town reserve 152, Manchester St N		part section adjoining British Hotel	
Sanders S. H. or E. J.			Kilmore St (S H); cnr Lichfield & Colombo (E J)	
Savage, William			2 houses & land, St Asaph St	ditto
Smith, (Miss) D.				
Stapleton, Thomas				house & land, N Avon Rd
Stone, Joseph		50 acre rural sec. W. Eyreton	Cranmer Sq.	
Thiele, Augustus	sec Avonside; sec N Stanmore Rd	ditto		
Thompson, F. or John				
Tinker, John		house & land, Tuam St E		
Vincent, J. or William (prob W)	house, Colombo St; Lyttelton; Rangiora (W)	house, Colombo St; Lyttelton; Rangiora (W)	house, Colombo St (W)	Colombo St; pt town reserve 105 (W)
Wilcox, John S	pt rural sec 40, Lytt	ditto	pt town sec 98, pt sect 25, Lytt	ditto
Wilkin, R. or J. T.				
Wilson, William (to check)				

Woodward, John		rural sec 8322, Ferry Rd		

APPENDIX 2: GENERAL STATISTICS

Fig 1: Population of Canterbury
(source: Scotter *History of Canterbury* p. 323)

Year	European Pop.	Arrivals	Departures	Excess
1860	15, 370	1, 889	289	1, 600
1861	16, 040	996	226	770
1862	20, 432	2, 973	205	2, 768
1863	27, 039	4, 995	265	4, 730
1864	32, 276	3, 247	284	2, 963
1865	48, 618	1, 895	218	1, 677
1866	58, 752	1, 341	227	1, 114
1867	53, 866	1, 356	215	1, 141
1868	40, 714	1, 071	355	716
1869	42, 852	1, 090	516	574
1870	45, 653	1, 696	410	1, 286
1871	48, 837	1, 307	489	818
1872	51, 441	1, 703	580	1, 123
1873	55, 204	2, 692	392	2, 300
1874	71, 316	12, 304	720	11, 584
1875	78, 715	5, 888	685	5, 203
1876	84, 062	3, 142	447	2, 695

[redacted] incl. figs for W. Canty

Fig 2: Number of General Assembly Electors in the Greater Christchurch Area, 1867
(Source: *Census and Statistics of New Zealand 1867*)

Electorate	Total Male Pop.	No. of Electors	% of Electors in Male Pop. Aged 21 and Up
Avon	2, 187	865	89.73
Heathcote	3, 471	1, 186	68.91
City of Christchurch	3, 335	1, 264	71.13
Lyttelton	1, 235	304	47.5

Fig 3: Canterbury Occupations, 1867
(Source: ibid)

Occupation	Number	% of Canty Population
Trade/Commerce/Manufacture	2, 723	5.06
Mechanics/Artificers/Skilled Workers	3, 123	5.8
Agricultural and Pastoral	4, 239	7.87
Labourers	3, 316	6.16
Legal	40	0.28 (Professionals)
Clerical	51	
Medical	62	
Teachers	229	O.6
Surveyors	49	
Other Educated Profesionals	47	
Mariners etc	814	1.51
No Occupation (pimarily women & children)	28, 365	52.65
Misc.	1, 845	3.14
Mining	6, 776	12.58
Domestic and General Servants	2, 187	4.06
Total	53, 866	

Fig 4: Canterbury Manufactories, 1867

(Source: ibid)

Note: In 1867 Canterbury had 63 manufactories with 497 employees; second only to Auckland with 84 manufactories and 915 employees.

Manufactories	Number
Cordial and Ginger Beer	10
Iron and Brass Founders	5
Sawmills, sash and door manufacture	14
Coach Builders	5
Fell Mongeries, Tanneries, Wool Scourers	6
Brick & Tile Yards, Potteries	5
Candle & Soap Works	2
Malt Kilns	5
Ship & Ship Building	3
Biscuit Manufacture	1
Colleries	1
Gas Works	2
Lime Kilns	1
Building Stone Quarries	4

Fig 5: Principal Religious Denominations in Canterbury, 1867

(Source: ibid)

Denominations	Male	Female	%
Church of England	16, 763	11, 413	52.13
Presbytarian	6, 059	3, 442	17.64
Roman Catholic	4, 707	2, 446	13.28
Weslayan	2, 940	2, 324	9.77
Primitive Methodist	110	42	0.28
Baptist	479	352	1.54
Congregationalist Independent	476	333	1.5

Lutheran	824	78	1.68

Fig 6: Revenue and Expenditure, Canterbury Province (incl West Cantyerbury until 21 Dec. 1867)

(Source: ibid)

Note: expenditure figures for 1861-2 unavailable; Roads/Works figures for 1872 onwards were absorbed into a larger category which included railway and harbour works.

Year	Revenue (£) (territorial & ordinary)	Expenditure (£)	
		Roads/Works	Total
1860	106, 130	-	-
1861	145, 448	-	-
1862	294, 572	134, 488	226, 405
1863	302, 630	264, 590	375, 693
1864	365, 373	227, 603	373, 848
1865	393, 595	70, 808	347, 524
1866	639, 747	133, 365	520, 165
1867	562, 870	99, 799	428, 754
1868	259, 999	74, 841	317, 417
1869	190, 617	25, 275	202, 314
1870	197, 423	75, 142	163, 650
1871	206, 797	40, 776	223, 066
1872	390, 999	-	233, 247
1873	920, 965	-	396, 448
1874	1, 023, 234	-	687, 065
1875	733, 066	-	771, 359

Fig 7: Land Sales in Canterbury Province
(Source: ibid)

Year	Country Waste (Crown) Lands Sold (acres)	Total Crown Land Sales (£)
1862	103, 284	207, 327
1863	94, 126	189, 923
1864	115, 839	233, 823
1865	63, 654	128, 035
1866	86, 619	178, 757
1867	44, 485	138, 083
1868	20, 227	39, 196
1869	15, 624	30, 892
1870	17, 447	34, 923
1871	19, 234	38, 693
1872	105, 373	211, 754
1873	281, 771	566, 930
1874	268, 060	540, 662
1875	101, 464	204, 872

Fig 8; Value of Imports/Exports of Canterbury Province (incl. West Canterbury until 1867)
(Source: ibid)

Year	Imports (£)	Exports (£)
1860	302, 939	209, 454
1861	403, 288	213, 555
1862	714, 252	258, 667
1863	899, 237	356, 940
1864	882, 788	406, 381
1865	900, 582	1, 575, 062
1866	1, 624, 637	2, 688, 233
1867	1, 621, 033	2, 205, 532
1868	609, 921	683, 795
1869	546, 804	498, 328
1870	510, 640	800, 349
1871	566, 069	712, 645
1872	671, 419	858, 425
1873	1, 084, 298	952, 095
1874	1, 568, 826	1, 108, 531
1875	1, 302, 440	1, 238, 402

W. Canterbury goldrush

Fig 8; Value of Imports/Exports of Canterbury Province (incl. West Canterbury until 1867)
(Source: ibid)

Year	Imports (£)	Exports (£)
1860	302, 939	209, 454
1861	403, 288	213, 555
1862	714, 252	258, 667
1863	899, 237	356, 940
1864	882, 788	406, 381
1865	900, 582	1, 575, 062
1866	1, 624, 637	2, 688, 233
1867	1, 621, 033	2, 205, 532
1868	609, 921	683, 795
1869	546, 804	498, 328
1870	510, 640	800, 349
1871	566, 069	712, 645
1872	671, 419	858, 425
1873	1, 084, 298	952, 095
1874	1, 568, 826	1, 108, 531
1875	1, 302, 440	1, 238, 402

W. Canterbury goldrush

REFERENCES

Primary

Appendix to the Journal of the House of Representatives (AJHR) 1870

Barker, M (Lady) *Station Life in New Zealand* Christchurch: Whitcomb and Tombs, 1950.

Census of New Zealand/ Statistics of New Zealand 1867

The Christchurch Press

Electoral Rolls of the Province of Canterbury (CPER) Canterbury Provincial Government: Christchurch, 1868 and 1872.

The Lyttelton Times Christchurch

New Zealand Parliamentary Debates (NZPD) 1867

Swainson, W. *New Zealand and its Colonization* 1859.

Wise's Commercial Directory 1872.

Wright, T. ("The Journeyman Engineer") *The Great Unwashed* London: Frank Cass & Co, 1970 (1868)

Secondary (unpublished)

Hayes, J. 'The Nature of the Canterbury Provincial Council Elections of 1866 and 1874, and their Implications for Fairburn's and Eldred-Grigg's Models of Colonial Society' History 630 Essay, University of Canterbury, 1995.

MacDonald 'The MacDonald Dictionary of Canterbury Biography' Canterbury Museum

McKimmey, P. 'The Temperance Movement in New Zealand 1835-1894' History Thesis, Auckland University, 1968.

Norris, P. 'A Social Portrait of Canterbury in 1870' MA thesis, University of Canterbury, 1964.

Pitcaithy, A. 'A History of Canterbury, New Zealand 1861-67' MA thesis, Canterbury College, 1935.

Silcock, R. 'Immigration into Canterbury under the Provincial Government' MA thesis, University of Canterbury, 1963.

Secondary (published)

Arnold, R. *The Farthest Promised Land: English Villagers, New Zealand Immigrants of the 1870's* Wellington: Victoria University Press/Price Milburn, 1981.

Best, G. *Mid Victorian Britain 1851-75* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

Biagini, E. *Liberty, Retrenchment, and Reform: Popular Liberalism in the Age of Gladstone 1860-1880* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Biagini, E. and Reid, A. (ed) *Currents of Radicalism: Popular Radicalism, Organized Labour and Party Politics in Britain 1850-1914* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Briggs, A. 'The Language of Class in Early Nineteenth Century England' in Flinn, M. and Smout, T. (ed) *Essays in Social History* Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1974. p 154-177

Brooking, T. 'Use it or Loose it: Unravelling the Land Debate in Late Nineteenth Century New Zealand' *The Journal of New Zealand History* (NZJH) 30.2 (1996)

Chambers, W. *Our Yesterdays 1840-1950: Being a Short History of Methodism in Canterbury, New Zealand* 1950.

Cocker, J. *Temperance and Prohibition in New Zealand* London: The Epworth Press, 1930.

Colbeck, M. *Village Yorkshire: a Pilgrimage through History and the Broad Acres* London: B T Batsford, 1987.

Cookson, J. *Upper Riccarton Methodist Church: A Centennial Retrospect 1886-1986* Upper Riccarton Methodist Church, 1986.

Crossick, G. and Haupt, H-G. *The Petty Bourgeoisie in Europe 1780-1914: Enterprize, Family, and Independence* London: Routledge, 1995.

Deeks, J., Parker, J. and Ryan, R. *Labour and Employment Relations in New Zealand* Auckland: Longman Paul, 1991.

The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography (DNZB) vol. I (W. Oliver ed.) and vol. II (C. Orange ed.)Wellington; Bridget Williams Books/Dept. of Internal Affairs, 1990 & 1993.

Dingle, A. *The Campaign for Prohibition in Victorian England* London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Eldred-Grigg, S. *Pleasures of the Flesh; Sex and Drugs in Colonial New Zealand 1840-1915* Wellington; A. H. & A. W. Reed, 1984.

Eldred-Grigg, S. *A Southern Gentry: New Zealanders' who Inherited the Earth* Auckland; Heineman Reed, 1980.

Fairburn, M. *The Ideal Society and its Enemies* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1989.

Gosden, P. *Self Help: Voluntary Associations in Nineteenth Century Britain* London: B T Batsford, 1973.

Hamer, D. *Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Roseberry: A Study of Leadership and Policy* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Hamer, D. *The New Zealand Liberals: The Years of Power 1891-1912* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1988.

Hammond, J. Roth, B. *Toil and Trouble: The Struggle for a Better Life in New Zealand* Auckland: Methuen, 1981.

Harrison, B. *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-72* London: Faber and Faber, 1971.

Hensley, G. 'Canterbury, 1853-57: The Superintendency of J E Fitzgerald'*A History of Canterbury : Vol. II ; General History 1854-76 and Cultural Aspects, 1850-1950* W. J. Gardner (ed.), Christchurch: Canterbury Centennial Historical and Literary Committee/ Whitcomb and Tombs, 1971.

Hopkins, E. *Working Class Self Help in Nineteenth Century England* New York: St Martins, 1995.

Joyce, P. *Visions of the People; Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1840-1914* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Kelly, T. *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain: From the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992.

McAloon, J. "Artisan Democracy in New Zealand: Nelson in the 1850's" *History Now* 3.2, 1997.

McIntyre, S. *A Colonial Liberalism: The World of Three Victorian Visionaries* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Martin, J. *The Forgotten Worker; The Rural Wage Earner in Nineteenth Century New Zealand* Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Trade Union History Project, 1990.

Martin, J., "Unemployment, Government, and the Labour Market in New Zealand, 1860-1890" *New Zealand Journal of History* 29.2, 1995.

Morrison, J. *The Evolution of a City: The Story of the Growth of the City and Suburbs of Christchurch, the Capital of Canterbury in the Years 1850-1903* Christchurch City Council: Christchurch, 1948.

Neale, R. *Class in English History 1680-1850* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

New Zealand Federation of University Women; Canterbury Branch. *St Albans: From Swamp to Suburbs - An Informal History* Christchurch, 1989.

Olssen, E. *Building the New World: Work, Politics, and Society in Caversham 1880's-1920's* Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1995.

Parry, J. *Democracy and Religion: Gladstone and the Liberal Party 1867-75* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Price, R. "The Working Man's Club Movement, and Victorian Social Reform Ideology" *Victorian Studies* 15.2, 1971.

Roth, H. "Unemployment Among New Zealand Carpenters 1876-1900" *Australian Economic History Review* 18.1, 1978.

Roth, H. and Hammond, J. *Toil and Trouble: the Struggle for a Better Life in New Zealand* Auckland: Methuen, 1981.

Salmond, J. *New Zealand Labour's Pioneering Days: The History of the Labour Movement in New Zealand from 1840 to 1894* Auckland: Forward Press, 1950.

Scotter, W. 'Canterbury, 1857-68: The Superintendencies of W. S. Moorhouse (1857-63; 1866-68) and Samuel Bealey (1863-66)' and 'Canterbury, 1868-76: The Superintendency of William Rolleston'*A History of Canterbury : Vol. II* ibid.

Smith, F. *The Making of the Second Reform Bill* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1966.

Stedman-Jones, G. *Language of Class: Studies in English Working Class History 1832-1982* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Tholfsen, T. *Working Class Radicalism in Mid-Victorian England* London: Croom Helm, 1976.

Thomson, D. "Colonial Thrift" *History Now* 3.1, 1997.